

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, January 25, 1917.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord God, whose glory shines round about us on land and sea and sky and whose goodness pours itself out in a thousand blessings new every morning and fresh every evening, we thank Thee for the æsthetic sense which enables us to appreciate the beauties thus displayed and for the gratitude which inspires worship and praise. And we pray that we may walk worthy of such preferment in the wake of Him who taught us nobility of soul and the splendor of a perfect character, and Thine be the praise forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE—PUBLIC-BUILDING INVESTIGATION.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, I move a change of reference of the bill H. R. 20410, to create a temporary building commission for the purpose of investigating all the public-building needs and methods of the United States in order to recommend a public-building policy, from the Committee on Appropriations to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida, by authority of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, moves that the bill H. R. 20410 be rereferred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds from the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman kindly inform the House what is the scope of the bill that is proposed to be referred from the Appropriations Committee to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The title expresses it very fully, I think.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I understand the bill was referred to the Committee on Appropriations because it carries an appropriation of \$50,000, and the practice of the Speaker has been, when Members insist on referring bills carrying appropriations to committees that have not jurisdiction of such bills, to refer them to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? All of the public-building bills, of whatsoever kind, carry authorization of appropriations. That is all this seeks to do.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is a different thing. Authorization and appropriation are two different things.

Mr. BURNETT. The form of the bill as introduced is for a direct appropriation. Would that oust the jurisdiction of the committee because somebody has put it in the form of an appropriation?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; it does.

Mr. LANGLEY. The subject matter of the bill is properly one that should go to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The SPEAKER. Committees not authorized to make appropriations begin to crop out in that regard. However, this committee never did.

Mr. BURNETT. Some other committees are doing it now.

The SPEAKER. I know. That is what the Chair is talking about. Finally the Chair announced that he intended to refer bills that carried appropriations to the Committee on Appropriations. If he did not do that, every committee in the House would be making appropriations.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] to rerefer this bill to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

EXAMINATIONS ON ELLIS ISLAND.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Speaker, I move to discharge the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization from the further consideration of the present resolution, which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 370.

Resolved, That the Secretary of Labor be directed to send to the House of Representatives a copy of the examinations into conditions on Ellis Island, taken by and before Byron H. Uhl, assistant commissioner of immigration, at Ellis Island July 25, 26, and 27, 1916.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that is not a preferred matter. It does not come within the rule.

The SPEAKER. What point of order does the gentleman make?

Mr. BURNETT. That it is not preferred. The gentleman can not call it up at this time without unanimous consent.

Mr. BENNET. The gentleman means it is not privileged?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

The SPEAKER. This resolution was introduced on September 8.

Mr. BENNET. It is strictly privileged under the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. This resolution has been privileged for some time.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Speaker, I move that the committee be discharged from further consideration of it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, did the Speaker overrule the point of order that it is not privileged? The rule is that the House can call for information in the possession of the head of a department. This resolution requests a copy of certain documents, or examination, taken at Ellis Island, which does not appear on the face of the resolution to be in the possession of the Secretary.

The SPEAKER. The resolution is:

Resolved, That the Secretary of Labor be directed to send to the House of Representatives a copy of the examinations into conditions on Ellis Island, taken by and before Byron H. Uhl, assistant commissioner of immigration, at Ellis Island July 25, 26, and 27, 1916.

It was introduced on September 8 and referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, this requires certain labor on the part of the head of the department. It is not calling for information in his possession but for a copy of certain testimony.

Mr. BENNET. It is calling for nothing but information. It is calling for facts.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It does not call for facts. It asks the Secretary to make a copy of something and send it to the House.

Mr. BENNET. It always requires labor to comply with a request of the House of Representatives. All that is necessary to do is to make a copy of that and send it.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BURNETT. On the point of order?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it is not a matter of information that is asked for, but it is a matter of the copying of the contents of a lot of papers. A matter of information would be answered by giving the information that the Secretary of Labor has, but instead of asking for the information that the Secretary of Labor has it is asking for the copy of a whole lot of papers without indicating how much, or what they relate to, or anything of the kind, except investigation at Ellis Island.

I do not think it is within the rule in respect to calling for information, because it may involve an immense amount of work in making copies of papers.

Mr. FITZGERALD. He might be entitled to call for documents in possession of the department, but under the guise of a privileged resolution to compel the Secretary to furnish him with a copy of a deposition is something new in our practice. It is not calling for a document in the possession of the Secretary, but merely for a copy of such a document. We may have the right to call for documents, but I know of no right, as a matter of privilege here, to compel department heads to copy and send them to us.

Mr. MANN. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is queer to me for the gentleman from New York to make the argument that the House can not call for a copy of a document in the possession of a department.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It can call for the document itself.

Mr. MANN. There is no right to insist that the original document be sent to the House. We call for information; that is, for a copy of the document on file. That is what we usually call for.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This is not a document at all. The gentleman has not called for information. He has called for a copy of something.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not believe that this resolution comes within the rule. The point of order is sustained.

PERMISSION TO A COMMITTEE TO SIT DURING SESSIONS.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Kentucky rise?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. For the purpose of asking the consent of the House that the Committee on the District of Columbia may sit during the sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia be authorized to sit during the sessions of the House. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. CRAGO. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of asking unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a brief summary of the life and death of Joseph Benton Donley, formerly a Representative in the Forty-first Congress, who died at his home at Waynesburg, Pa., on January 23 last.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting the matter indicated by him. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

JOSEPH BENTON DONLEY.

The summary of the life and death of former Representative Donley is as follows:

Joseph Benton Donley, a former Representative from Pennsylvania; born in Mount Morris, Pa., October 10, 1838; completed preparatory studies; was graduated from Waynesburg College in 1859; entered the Union Army as a captain of the Eighty-third Illinois Infantry in 1862; was graduated from the law university of Albany, N. Y., in May, 1866, and admitted to the bar; elected as a Republican to the Forty-first Congress (March 4, 1869–March 3, 1871); after retirement from Congress practiced law in Waynesburg, Pa. He died at his home in Waynesburg Wednesday, January 23, 1917.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the following concurrent resolution, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

Senate concurrent resolution 30.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Wednesday, the 14th day of February, 1917, at 1 o'clock in the afternoon, pursuant to the requirements of the Constitution and laws relating to the election of President and Vice President of the United States, and the President of the Senate shall be their presiding officer; that two tellers shall be previously appointed on the part of the Senate and two on the part of the House of Representatives, to whom shall be handed, as they are opened by the President of the Senate, all the certificates and papers purporting to be certificates of the electoral votes, which certificates and papers shall be opened, presented, and acted upon in the alphabetical order of the States, beginning with the letter A; and said tellers, having then read the same in the presence and hearing of the two Houses, shall make a list of the votes as they shall appear from the said certificates; and the votes having been ascertained and counted in the manner and according to the rules by law provided, the result of same shall be delivered to the President of the Senate, who shall thereupon announce the state of the vote, which announcement shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons, if any, elected President and Vice President of the United States, and, together with a list of the votes, be entered on the Journals of the two Houses.

RIVER AND HARBOR BILL.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for further consideration of the bill H. R. 20079, the river and harbor bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 20079, with Mr. RAINEY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order. The House is in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 20079, the river and harbor bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 20079) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Waterway from Mississippi River to Bayou Teche, La.: For improvement in accordance with the smaller project submitted in House Document No. 610, Sixty-third Congress, second session, \$100,000: *Provided*, That no expense shall be incurred by the United States for acquiring any lands required for the purpose of this improvement: *Provided further*, That this provision shall not be construed as authorizing the purchase or improvement of any privately owned canals or waterways.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

Amend, on page 22, line 2, after the word "lands," by inserting the words "and easements."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Bayous Vermilion and Plaquemine Brule, and Mermentau River, La.: For maintenance, including channel, bay, and passes of Bayou Vermilion, and tributaries of Mermentau River, \$46,000.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DUPRÉ: On page 22, line 15, after the word "for," insert "continuing improvement and."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sabine River, La. and Tex.: For improvement in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 668, Sixty-third Congress, second session, \$30,000: *Provided*, That all sunken logs and timber taken by the United States, after due notice, from said stream, or from any other navigable waters of the United States, in the process of clearing them for navigation, shall become the property of the United States, subject to sale, and that the proceeds of sale shall go to the credit of the improvement.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against this item on page 23, from line 1 to line 10. It is beyond the scope of privileged matter which can be reported in a river and harbor bill, in that we assume the right of legislation for all navigable streams in addition to the item in the paragraph.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I can not understand what the point of order is.

Mr. TREADWAY. The item for taking logs from navigable streams and assuming them to be owned by the Government, irrespective of the fact that it applies solely to that stream, is beyond the scope of privileged matter under a river and harbor bill. The item is not privileged matter in a river and harbor bill, and therefore it is out of order under Rule XI, as to the rights of the River and Harbor Committee.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to state that this item has the indorsement of the Engineers of the War Department, and has been thoroughly investigated. It is not taking a penny from the Government, but, on the other hand, something will be returned. The logs returned will be of great profit. I hope the gentleman will not insist on his point of order. This will not cost the Government a penny, but will return some money to the Government. It is a limitation solely, and it will save money to the Government.

Mr. TREADWAY. There is no proof whatever that the logs in the stream do belong to the Government. We are assuming ownership of them and beginning all kinds of legal entanglements by proposing this legislation and making it general legislation as well as applying to this particular item.

I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the sentence on line 6 reads, "or from any other navigable waters of the United States." I maintain that is beyond the scope of our rights as a Committee on Rivers and Harbors to retain or report an item of that sort.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has jurisdiction of the improvement of rivers and harbors. This provision is clearly in the interest of the improvement of the Sabine River. By reference to the project, if the Chair desires to refer to the project, he will ascertain that the object of the improvement is in the interest of navigation. It is for the improvement of the river by the taking out of logs to increase the navigability of the stream, the logs now obstructing very materially the navigation of that river.

The CHAIRMAN. There can not be any doubt about that, but the question is whether the Government has any right to sell them.

Mr. SPARKMAN. This provides means for the removal of these logs, a little different, to be sure, from the ordinary method we would pursue for taking logs from the stream. But it is intended to accomplish that purpose. It provides, of course, that the logs shall be taken out, that a dredge or boat shall be constructed at the cost mentioned in the report, and that boat having been constructed it shall be utilized in taking out these logs, which shall be condemned and sold by the Government and the proceeds applied to the cost of taking out the logs and the cleaning out of the stream.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Certainly.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Would it not obviate the objection of the gentleman from Massachusetts if an amendment was adopted so as to limit the arrangement to that particular stream, and not have it apply to other navigable waters of the United States?

Mr. TREADWAY. I will say to the gentleman that if an amendment of that kind is offered I should be disposed to withdraw my point of order—if you make it apply solely to this one stream.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment: Strike out in line 6, beginning with the word "or," the remainder of the line and the word "States" in line 7.

Mr. DUPRÉ. And also change the word "them" in line 7 to "it."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. TREADWAY. And the word "such" should be inserted before the word "sale" in line 9.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 23, by striking out after the word "stream" in line 6 the words "or from any other navigable waters of the United States"; strike out the word "them" in line 7 and insert "it"; and in line 9, after the first word "of" before the word "sale," insert the word "such."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, now that the reason for the point of order that I raised has been removed, I will withdraw it, and I would like to speak to the merits of the item. I move to strike out the item.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to renew the point of order against the paragraph as it stands.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I make the point of order that the gentleman's point of order comes too late. There has been discussion on the paragraph.

Mr. ASWELL. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman. Does not the point of order come too late?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that a paragraph might be subject to a point of order with one wording and not subject to a point of order with another. The fact that the amendment was adopted and certain words stricken from the paragraph might make the remainder of the paragraph subject to a point of order, whereas it was free from it before the amendment was adopted.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan makes his point of order now after the paragraph has been amended and discussed. It is clear that it comes too late under the rule to make a point of order against the paragraph that has been both amended and discussed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the universal rule is that a point of order may be reserved, but an amendment can not be offered while a point of order is reserved or while a point of order is pending. When the point of order is reserved and withdrawn and an amendment is offered it is too late to make a point of order against the paragraph. It would not be too late to make a point of order against the amendment, but in this case the point of order was made and withdrawn and an amendment was offered amending the paragraph in three places. It is too late to make a point of order against the paragraph; otherwise in the House we might amend a provision after a long debate and then the point of order made against it. The rule of the House is very strict. In the Senate they have a different rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the point of order to the paragraph comes too late.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 23, by striking out the paragraph beginning in line 1 and ending in line 10.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much to object to this item; it is a very small item, and I realize that there are several Members of the House who are interested in it. I think, however, the principle involved is serious and objectionable.

The question involved is whether or not the Government can get its pay for the expense of dredging a stream by selling the logs that it takes out of the stream. As we have now removed the feature of general legislation, making it applicable everywhere, the item is not as objectionable as before, but nevertheless we are a great institution to follow precedents. We are establishing a precedent by voting this item into the bill which will come back time and again in the future to plague us if we are going to have future river and harbor legislation.

I wish to call particular attention to this House that it ought not, for the sake of gratifying a local representative that the

logs may be gotten out of the stream in his neighborhood, to adopt a form of new legislation relative to river and harbor work. We are taking a very serious legal step. Has this Government any right to assume ownership over these logs? If it is a raft that is floated down stream, somebody owns it and somebody formed it. Somebody owns the adjoining bank where the logs may have fallen into the stream. Who is to determine that we own these logs and can sell them in order to pay the expenses of getting them out or snagging them? Let us go a little easy on this item.

Further than that, let us see what the report of the engineers say in reference to it. I read from the House document, page 668, Sixty-third Congress, second session—

To give a navigable channel for draft of 3 feet for the entire year. The district officer is of opinion that the cost of improvement by any suitable method would be excessive, and he expresses the opinion that this river is not worthy of further improvement at this time. In this opinion the division engineer concurs.

The board states that this river is very greatly obstructed by logs, snags, and so forth—

the removal of which would undoubtedly be expensive and out of reasonable proportion to the resulting benefits if the costs were entirely borne by the United States. If, however, the United States can be reimbursed by the sale of logs—

Mark you, that does not say that the engineers say they think it should be reimbursed, but simply—

If, however, the United States can be reimbursed by the sale of logs removed from the bed of the stream in the progress of the improvement, it believes the cost might come within reasonable limits.

Mr. Chairman, certainly that is a very negative approval of the project on the part of the Chief of Engineers, and then the board goes on to recommend this very general legislation which we have just voted out of this item, and then continues to say that with that authority granted them, namely, this general authority, it would recommend that possibly the Government might get even and get its money back under the logging process. Therefore, I maintain that we are entering upon a very doubtful legal step in assuming that we can snag the logs out of the river and that they belong to the Government. They do not belong to the Government.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Just a moment. Further than that, the project is not approved upon its merits by the Board of Engineers. I now yield.

Mr. ASWELL. Is it not the custom of the War Department to sell the logs they take out of the streams?

Mr. TREADWAY. It is a legal question whether any such right exists, and I do not think the Government has ever assumed ownership.

Mr. ASWELL. Is it not the custom?

Mr. TREADWAY. I do not think it is. It came up in the committee and was discussed there, and so far as I know we did not consider that the logs snagged out of the river belonged to the Government.

Mr. ASWELL. It is my information that it is the custom.

Mr. TREADWAY. It never has so appeared before our committee, and I am sure that it is a grave legal question in the mind of the chairman himself.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Certainly.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The gentleman was reading from the report of the Board of Engineers. Does the Board of Engineers recommend this particular project if the logs can be taken out and sold at a profit, or does it recommend the policy of taking the logs out and selling them?

Mr. TREADWAY. It hoped that the Government might give them the authority first, and then it continues, if I may be allowed to quote again in answer to the gentleman's question:

Contingent upon such legislation—

Namely, the legislation to which I have referred and which we have already cut out—

the board recommends that an appropriation of \$30,000 be made for the construction of a suitable snag boat, and its operation for a period of one year on the Sabine River, and that the work of clearing the river continue thereafter so long as sufficient revenue is derived from the sale of logs to pay for the operation of the plant.

The engineers themselves say very distinctly that the only way the Government can ever get square on the deal is to sell the logs.

The report further says:

While estimates of cost are not ordinarily presented in reports on preliminary examinations, the estimate given by the board is entirely for plant and its operation, no survey or other investigation being required to determine the probable expenditure required.

So far as we can pay for it by selling something that does not belong to us the engineers advocate it.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. COX. The paragraph under consideration provides for the improvement of this river by taking the proceeds derived from the sale of logs and applying them to the improvement of the river. My query is this: With the language in the bill just as it is, with these amendments incorporated in it, supposing the Government does not derive enough money with which to pay for this \$30,000 snag boat, then will the improvement go on or will it have to stop?

Mr. TREADWAY. The only way it is recommended, the only way the engineers recommend it, is upon the assumption that we are going to get enough money to pay \$30,000 for the boat. If they do not, they do not recommend its being done.

Mr. COX. That being true, suppose the provision in the bill remains in the bill and becomes permanent law, then will they have the power and the appropriation to go ahead and make the boat?

Mr. TREADWAY. From my experience in this body, which I admit is somewhat short, I am led to think that if we do not get the \$30,000 from the sale of the logs, in the next Congress the advocates of the measure would come back and say, "Why, we have this \$30,000 boat down there and it is a shame to let it lie idle, so let us pay the expense of it and get the snags out."

Mr. COX. Then the gentleman thinks the improvement would go ahead?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, this is about the only project in this bill in which it is found that the cost of maintenance can probably be obtained through the value of the material recovered in the bottom of the channel. It appears from the report that the upper reaches of the river which it is proposed to improve are unusually filled with sunken logs, saw logs, commercial logs, logs which have a value and which are readily marketable after they are gotten up from the bed of the river. It is well known that logs being sunk in fresh water do not deteriorate, but that no matter how long they remain in the water when taken up they are in the same condition and in as good condition as when they were originally sunken. I think everyone familiar with the subject will corroborate that statement. We have a proposition here for the improvement of a river in which it is recommended that \$30,000 be appropriated for the construction of a snag boat. The operation of that boat, the maintenance of the stream which involves the taking up of logs, is to be paid for by the sale of the logs which have a marketable value.

This is an item in the bill which, in accordance with the report of the engineers, is in the interest of economy. It saves to the United States the cost of any maintenance and it is estimated—

Mr. TREADWAY rose.

Mr. SMALL. I am coming to the legal part of it in a moment—it is estimated that the logs recovered from the river will be of sufficient value to pay for the operation of the snag boat and to clear this river of these sunken logs. The report shows that the value of the logs in this stream is estimated to be of the value of a half a million dollars. Now, Mr. Chairman, as to the legal right of Congress to appropriate these logs to public use. This is a public highway as to which the United States has the same authority and jurisdiction as the States would have over any public highway. Can it be doubted for a moment that if a person leaves property on a public highway and after due notice fails to remove it that the sovereign has the right to remove it and appropriate the property to its own use? This simply provides that after due public notice to whoever are the owners of these logs to remove them within a certain time, that if not removed the United States will remove them and appropriate the logs so removed to its own use by sale of same and expend the proceeds in the improvement of the highway or river which they impede. I think there can not be the slightest doubt that Congress has that right. These logs are derelicts. They have been there for years—some of them. They impede the navigable waters. The United States, the sovereign of that highway, certainly has the right to give notice to whoever may be the owner to remove them within a certain time, and if not removed that the sovereign itself will remove them and sell them and appropriate the value of the same to its own use. I think there can not be the slightest question in reference to that legal proposition.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SMALL. Certainly.

Mr. SLAYDEN. The Sabine is, in every sense of the word, actually and legally a navigable stream?

Mr. SMALL. I think so.

Mr. SLAYDEN. And it is the privilege of the Government, and I conceive it to be its duty, to keep it a navigable stream. Now, if it were filled with mud, they would have to remove the mud to improve the navigation of the stream. They would get nothing for the mud. Now, is it not particularly fortunate under these circumstances that it will take out something else than mud by which it may remunerate itself for at least a part of the cost of the improvement?

Mr. SMALL. Whether fortunate or unfortunate, certainly the Government has the right in taking them out to say what shall be done with them and say that it appropriates to the public use these logs after they are taken out. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that in this case, where the appropriation is to furnish the instrumentality of the snag boat to be used in taking the obstructions out of this river, to wit, logs, and the actual expenditure necessary in taking out the logs is to be borne by the sale of the logs, it is a meritorious feature, instead of one to be condemned as the gentleman from Massachusetts seems to contend.

Mr. SAUNDERS. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. SMALL. Certainly.

Mr. SAUNDERS. What is done with snags we remove by the ordinary snagging process? They destroy them, do they not?

Mr. SMALL. They usually have no value and they are destroyed. They have no marketable value.

Mr. SAUNDERS. You can not put them on other people's land?

Mr. SMALL. No.

Mr. SAUNDERS. You can not set them afloat because that will be a detriment, so they destroy them.

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Then according to the analogy of that if we commence operations on the Sabine River to-day these logs have got to be pulled out and destroyed?

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Then there is an alternative that in lieu of destroying them the committee is endeavoring to cause them to pay some of the proportionate cost of removal.

Mr. SMALL. That is all; and it is estimated in this case that the logs are so numerous and so valuable that they would furnish a sufficient amount to pay for the cost of the operation of the snag boat, or, in other words, the cost of the maintenance.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. Certainly.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Have there been any decisions of the courts determining the title of marked logs raised under conditions prescribed in this bill?

Mr. SMALL. I can not say as to any decision of the courts of the United States, but there have been numerous decisions in the States that where property is left in a highway or left in a stream or otherwise abandoned that the sovereign, the legislature, has a right to prescribe conditions for their removal, and if not removed, that then they may be destroyed or appropriated to the public use.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. There is a law as to abandonment, but there is also a law as to marked logs with reference to the question of title, and the question of title there has been determined by a decision of the courts.

Mr. SMALL. Well, all that leads to the question of the right of the public as to obstructions in a public highway, in this case a navigable stream. Mr. Chairman, I think the item has merit and ought not to be stricken out.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, this item to which my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] referred, I am frank to say I do not think is a good one, but I think the gentleman from Massachusetts makes the point of order to the only good thing there is in it. I do not believe that this river ought to be improved, but if we do improve it we ought to leave in the provision that we now have in that section. I have no doubt about the legality or about the power of the Government to take these logs and condemn them and sell them. The Government has the power to remove any obstruction in navigable waters, and very frequently we have removed vessels. Out in my part of the country the Government removes fish traps worth thousands of dollars. Now, when logs are taken out of a stream they are either burned or otherwise destroyed or abandoned.

I think we will make a very great mistake if we do not permit the Government to take these logs and sell them where they are of value. What can be the use of compelling the Government to either destroy or abandon these logs if they are of any value? I regret that my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] made a point of order against the general legislation. The point

of order was well taken, of course, but that would have been a valuable piece of legislation and in my judgment ought to have been in here, and if the committee thinks this item should remain in the bill at all I think by all means we should leave in this provision in regard to selling these logs.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, having been in a hearing on the Committee on the Territories on the question of prohibition, which has been agitating the committee for some time, I happened not to be in the House when the section was reached, as it was at a time when it was not expected it would be reached in the bill. Therefore I could not present the views which I would have presented as to the general proposition of this section being in accordance with the general law which is already in existence, and for that reason, as well as for the reason that I wish to have the item retained in the bill, I will read the law on this subject, which is perfectly clear and conclusive. And I give the gentlemen who have thought there was no law sustaining this item the benefit of the fact that this law is incorporated in a general rivers and harbors act and not in a special statute, and for that reason I suppose has been overlooked in this discussion.

The act approved March 3, 1899, was entitled "An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes." Now, this is the way that section reads:

SEC. 19. That whenever the navigation of any river, lake, harbor, sound, bay, canal, or other navigable waters of the United States shall be obstructed or endangered by any sunken vessel, boat, water craft, raft, merchantable timber, or other similar obstruction, and such obstruction has existed for a longer period than 30 days, or whenever the abandonment of such obstruction can be legally established in a less space of time, the sunken vessel, boat, water craft, raft, logs, merchantable timber, or other obstruction shall be subject to be broken up, removed, sold, or otherwise disposed of by the Secretary of War, at his discretion, without liability for any damage to the owners of the same: *Provided*, That in his discretion the Secretary of War may cause reasonable notice of such obstruction of not less than 30 days, unless the legal abandonment of the obstruction can be established in a less time, to be given by publication, addressed "To whom it may concern" in a newspaper published nearest to the locality of the obstruction requiring the removal thereof: *And provided also*, That the Secretary of War may, in his discretion, at or after the time of giving such notice cause sealed proposals to be solicited by public advertisement, giving reasonable notice of not less than 10 days, for the removal of such obstruction as soon as possible after the expiration of the above specified 30 days' notice, in case it has not in the meantime been so removed, these proposals and contracts, at his discretion, to be conditioned that such vessel, boat, water craft, raft, merchantable timber, or other obstruction, and all cargo and property contained therein, shall become the property of the contractor, and the contract shall be awarded to the bidder making the proposition most advantageous to the United States: *Provided*, That such bidder shall give satisfactory security to execute the work: *Provided further*, That any money received from the sale of any such wreck, or from any contractor for the removal of wrecks, under this paragraph shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States.

We do provide the manner in which the notice shall be given to those who have any legal rights in the property. There is the right absolutely given to those who have the removal of the obstructions to take the obstructions, whether it be rafts, merchantable timber, or whatever character of obstruction it may be, out of the water, and the following section gives the right to the United States Government, after due notice, through an advertisement, to sell these obstructions which have been taken out, when they are worth being sold, and converted into money and covered into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, for 30 years this stream was one of the navigable streams, located partly in the State of Louisiana and partly in the State of Texas, and was used for the purpose of navigation, and on that account many of these logs have been dropped into the river from the rafts that were being towed in it by the boats that were carrying them to the mills up and down the river. For the last 15 years those obstructions have been so great as to impede the navigation of the river, and for a space of 30 or 40 miles to absolutely prevent it. The river is now navigable to where these logs are piled up in it, and below Orange, Tex., to the Gulf the river is already navigable, and the rivers and harbors bill that we are now considering has provided for appropriations for the Sabine River up to the city of Orange. There is no question about its being a navigable river. The logs are there, and the Board of Engineers report that the logs should be removed, and that it will take about \$30,000 to put a snag boat in the river and remove them, and the estimate is, there will be about \$500,000 worth of logs which can be taken out, and the money for them put into the United States Treasury. During the last few minutes the gentleman asked whether or not it would be acceptable for him to remove the logs under contract. Of course, I would not take any part in such a contract myself. He asked if we should not go in together and buy these logs. There are hundreds of people in that country who would be glad to buy these logs at many times the value that it would cost the Government of the United States to take them out. This is not a hasty report of the Board of En-

gineers. They fully considered this question before they reported on it. It was reported favorably by the Chief of Engineers and by the Board of Engineers, and was argued before the Board of Engineers by the United States Senator from Louisiana, by one Senator from Texas, and Members of the House from Louisiana and Arkansas at the time when the question was up, as to the importance of the navigation on the Sabine River.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this stream is in my district. I represent the State at large. A part of its length serves as a State line between Texas and Louisiana. The so-called obstruction of logs for about 30 miles prevents a regular continuous navigation for something over 200 miles. I have been up and down and all over the country adjacent to and surrounding the Sabine River. I live up toward the head in the interior of the State. These logs often float down during overflows for several hundred miles from immense timber belts, where they have been cut for sawmills. A vast forest of the finest kind of pine, white oak, red oak, and burr oak is found all up that river section. Instead of the timber being damaged by being under the water, I will say that an oak log after it lies in the water for several years is known in the markets of the world as "antique" oak, and is far more valuable than when fresh, and pine is not damaged. And for this timber to be converted into money is an easy problem, and I think we are adopting a proper method by being able to utilize some of the stuff we take out of a stream to pay for the labor invested in improving its value as a navigable stream.

I just wanted to make these remarks on this question.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I very much—

Mr. SPARKMAN. I would like to see if we can not place some limitation on this debate. How much time would the gentleman like?

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I would like another five minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto end in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in this paragraph, because it presents a situation with which I have had some experience in my district. In the first place, there is an unfavorable report by the Corps of Engineers, but the committee proposes an appropriation. The engineers have occasionally made unfavorable reports concerning harbors in my district, and in every case I have had to take my medicine. I never have been able to get an appropriation from this Congress for any harbor blacklisted by the Corps of Engineers. But it is said there is a saving clause here, in that there is an opportunity for lifting logs from the bottom of the river and disposing of them at a profit, and thereby meet the expense of the improvement. I live in a lumber district, or it was one years ago, at the mouth of a river down which as much log timber floated as over any river in this country. I believe I say that advisedly, and for hundreds of miles the bottom of that river is covered with sunken saw logs.

The Supreme Court of the State of Michigan in a well-considered opinion determined only a few years ago—four or five years ago—that the title to sunken logs remains in the original owners of them, and that anyone who disregards the rights of the original owner and raises logs and undertakes to appropriate them or the proceeds of their sale to his own use is liable for the value of them to the original owner. I was connected with litigation in the courts of our State where these questions were involved, so am somewhat familiar with them.

Now, as to the opportunity of making money out of the raising of these logs, I know of several instances where companies were organized for raising logs in that way, the incorporators having obtained assignments of the log marks from the original owners, those assignments carrying title to the sunken logs; and during the time the log-lifting companies carried on the business of raising logs there was loss in every case. There was, I believe, no instance of profit. No instance of profit is shown in all the experience of the men or companies who undertook that business. So there is nothing in this claim of the gentlemen from Texas that here is "a saving clause" which will justify this House if it wishes to adhere to the policy of following the report of the Board of Engineers or in overturning the report of the Board of Engineers or disregarding the first portion of it, which says that this project is altogether unworthy.

Now, I think, Mr. Chairman, that this Government might enact legislation making it legal and proper for the engineers

to lift these logs, so that the question of ownership of and title to the logs would not stand in the way of the improvement of a navigable stream. The title to these logs can be acquired, and in the course of improving a navigable stream the right can be acquired to take the logs from the bottom of the stream and convert them to the use of the Government or sell them and put the money in the Treasury. But that right can be acquired only after notice to the owners, and nothing being done by the original owners after due notice they can be held to have abandoned their property. The Government can then assume control of the property, remove it from the river, and sell it and devote the proceeds to meeting the expense of making the improvement.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. I do not call to mind the statute of Louisiana, but I think our statute in Texas covers all the right an original owner may have 250 miles above the raft. Two years after he is estopped from claiming ownership if they have passed off his region of territory. It may be the same in Louisiana.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. There is no such law in my State, and while, of course, I do not question the statement the gentleman makes I think his recollection is wrong. I believe there is now no law that will permit or protect the Government or its engineers in taking possession of the logs or appropriating to itself the proceeds of the sale of them. I believe there should be such a law; but I very much doubt the wisdom of Congress assuming to enact so important a provision by inserting these carelessly drawn lines in an appropriation bill.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, in view of the success I have had in offering amendments on the floor of the House, and in order to help my friend from Massachusetts in his effort to strike out this item, I wish to say a word. I know he will appreciate my efforts.

I want to suggest to the House that this argument seems to be in a wrong direction, because, as will be seen by the testimony I will submit to you, instead of the removal of the logs relieving navigation the logs will ruin navigation if they are once taken from the streams. [Laughter.] I read now from Document No. 668, page 3:

5. The district officer states that if the river were cleared of obstructions there would be a practicable channel to Logansport for boats drawing 3 feet at stages in the river corresponding to a gauge reading of not less than 9 feet. Such stage, however, averages only about four months per year, and there will probably be seasons when this navigable period will not exceed one to two months.

6. The district officer expresses the opinion that no improvement of the river with a view to open-river navigation will ever be advisable above mile 100, and that practical navigation on that section can only be secured by means of locks and dams. He states that the river may be susceptible of improvement below mile 130 for boats drawing 3 feet for about seven months and below mile 70 for the entire year. The information obtained in connection with the preliminary examination indicates that a complete removal of obstructions would be quite expensive, and the district officer expresses the opinion, in which the division engineer concurs, that the river is not worthy of further improvement at this time.

Then four gentlemen from this House, with one from the other end of the Capitol, went before the board and gave some expert information upon this subject of navigation, so that the board was convinced that they had made a mistake, and they had an open hearing. Here is something that was developed there—I read from page 8. I wish the committee would pay attention to this, because it is interesting. I read from paragraph 17. It says:

17. Open-river navigation therefore appears to be practicable only for an average period of about four months, and that such period will be in general during the period January to June, inclusive. It must be expected, also, that there will be seasons when this navigable period will be limited to from one to two months, with possibly less than one month of continuous navigation.

Now I will read from page 8, paragraph 18:

18. As there are no farm products to be moved during the high-water period, January to June, inclusive, the only industries to be benefited at present by improvement are those in the lumber business. These industries are large and important, but their life is a limited one. Further, it is doubtful if those interested in such industries desire any modification of the present channel conditions.

Now, we have got down to one month, Mr. Chairman, when it is reported they may have navigation. But, reading on page 25, from the letter of the Sabine Tram Co. to Maj. T. H. Jackson, I find this:

We have some 50 miles of river front along the Sabine River in Newton County, Tex. At this time we think it would do harm to the river instead of benefit, for the reason that whenever the logs are cleaned out it will result in lowering the water by letting it run off. This is shown north and south of our mill at Deweyville, Tex. By taking the logs and obstruction out it caused the river to get shallower each year the logs were removed. Mr. Axtell, while with the Government, was up at our mill while it was low. We think he was of the same opinion.

There is other evidence along that line. But here, Mr. Chairman, it appears that with the logs in the best they could do is to have one month's navigation in a year, and the people living along there say that if you take these logs out it will prevent navigation. In the light of all this testimony I ask you, Ought we not to leave them in there?

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that this item might be stricken from the bill, but my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] says that he realizes that his support of my proposition will concentrate support in favor of the item. [Laughter.] In spite of his assistance I wish to call attention in regard to two facts. On page 10 of the report in a preliminary examination by the district engineer, Maj. Jackson, I find that he states that the great question here is flood control and complete reclamation of the overflowed land. So it is not a question of navigation, it is one of flood control and complete reclamation of the land, according to the report of the engineer. I have not time to read all the applicable items from that report, but the whole thing is illuminating.

Let me call attention to this fact. I am reading from the report of Maj. Jackson, of the Corps of Engineers:

There can be no doubt that at the present there is no need of any improvement of this river, and it is certain that the cost of the removal of snags, drift, overhanging trees, and other accidental obstructions, so far as may be necessary to enable the stream to be used at low water and also at ordinary water stages by boats of as great a draft as permitted by the natural conditions of the stream when free of the above-named obstructions is too great to justify the expenditure. Further, it is my opinion that no improvement of this river with the view of open-river navigation will ever be advisable above about mile 100. If navigation is desired above that point, it must be obtained by the construction of locks and dams.

Now, Logansport, the place to which they are intending to get navigation, is 292 miles up stream, and the engineer says that there is no possible chance of getting navigation for more than 100 miles. So it looks as if that part of the river might be considered a nonnavigable stream according to the district engineer.

Now, we find here a statement from Gen. Black, Chief of Engineers, in support of this very testimony that there is no navigation on the river above mile 100, and, as I say, Logansport is 292 miles upstream. You are getting logs out of a nonnavigable stream.

Now, then, with reference to the legal claim and the law set up by the gentleman from Louisiana, and further referred to by the gentleman from North Carolina, let me say to the gentleman from Louisiana that if his definition of merchantable timber applied to these logs, why did the board of engineers come to Congress and ask for legislation authorizing them to sell these snagged-out logs? They knew that that law was in existence, and that if it applied to the logs in the Sabine River they never would ask to have this paragraph go into the bill, because they would know that they already had authority.

Furthermore, the gentleman from North Carolina states that it is very evident that we have the sovereign right, and so forth. He has put that up as his opinion. I do not question the gentleman's legal ability; I do not claim to have any. I am not a lawyer, but I am exercising a little horse sense in connection with this matter. I would like to ask the gentleman from North Carolina whether his opinion as to the sovereignty of the Government in this respect has ever been legally established in such a case as this. He makes his own statement of that fact, but there is nothing to back it up. Consequently we come back to the point where we started, when I say that we enter into very serious legal complications when we assume ownership of these logs in the stream. The river is not worthy of improvement, anyway; it is not worth the improvement unless you can pay for the logs that the Government gets, and if we do take them and use them as our own we are getting into bad legal complications. The whole thing is wrong.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. I am surprised to hear the gentleman from Massachusetts make such a profound legal argument when he says he is not a lawyer. Did the gentleman ever hear of the old English common-law doctrine of flotsam and jetsam, by which the sovereign has the right to seize everything floating in navigable waters?

Mr. TREADWAY. Evidently the gentleman from Louisiana does not consider these logs flotsam and jetsam; he seems to think they are valuable; but, nevertheless, it seems to me that the item is unworthy of a place in the river and harbor bill. It is this kind of items that renders us liable to the criticisms that are heaped upon us, taking all the good projects and putting a few of the bad ones up against them in the balance.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to correct an erroneous statement made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN]. That gentleman is usually so accurate that I am

sure he would desire to be corrected in this instance. He stated that this proposition had not received a favorable report. He is mistaken in that. There was a favorable report on this project. It is well known under the law that the question of whether a favorable report exists depends on the final report and recommendation of the Chief of Engineers. It is possible that there should be an unfavorable report by the district engineer; it is possible that there should be an unfavorable report by the division engineer, and also by the board of review, known as the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and yet if the Chief of Engineers makes a favorable recommendation and report, then it is deemed that the project has a favorable report.

In this instance, it is true, the district engineer did not make a favorable recommendation, based solely on the ground that the cost was excessive, and the division engineer concurred with him, but when it went before the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors that board reviewed the evidence, and after a full hearing of the evidence they reached the conclusion that the improvement was desirable, based on the condition that the fund for its maintenance should be provided by the proceeds of sales of sunken logs which have been removed from navigable streams, and the Chief of Engineers concurred with the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, making thereby a favorable report.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will the Committee on Rivers and Harbors recommend the abandonment of this proposition if the proceeds from selling the logs do not yield a profit?

Mr. SMALL. I can say for this member of the committee that if it transpires that the proceeds from the sale of the logs are not sufficient to pay the cost of maintenance, I would be opposed to continuing the project.

Mr. Chairman, I only desired to correct the inadvertent statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN]. I do not desire to go further into the legality of it, except to give this illustration. In 1899, in the river and harbor act, there was a provision which has been repeated since forbidding persons moving logs by raft or otherwise from dropping them into the channel of the river and making it a misdemeanor if they did so, so that these logs in the bottom of the river are there now as the result of a violation of law. One other illustration. We have a statute as to derelicts in navigable streams. If a barge is sunk or a vessel or a steamer, we have a statute now which provides that after notice the War Department, through the engineers, may destroy or remove the derelict, and if they may remove and destroy obstructions in navigable streams, certainly that implies and carries with it the right to utilize them for any purpose the Government may deem proper.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Bayou Grossetete, La.: For maintenance, \$1,000.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the Savannah, Ga., items, by the insertion therein of certain documents.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks: unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The documents referred to are as follows:

SAVANNAH, GA., December 8, 1916.

HON. CHARLES G. EDWARDS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. EDWARDS: I beg to acknowledge receipt of your telegram of this date, advising us that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has decided against hearing arguments from committees seeking appropriations for their ports. We appreciate that you have done, and are doing, everything possible for Savannah and feel that our interests are safe in your hands.

Mr. Conant has prepared some data which he is mailing to you tonight, and Maj. Williamson also has prepared some good arguments which he will forward to you. If there is anything we can do at any time to further the interests of the desired appropriation let me know by wire and it will have prompt attention.

With sincere regards,

W. J. PIERPONT, Mayor.

SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA., ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF ADOPTING THE PROJECT FOR FURTHER IMPROVEMENTS, AS RECOMMENDED BY THE BOARD OF ENGINEERS AND CHIEF OF ENGINEERS, BY E. R. CONANT, CHIEF ENGINEER, SAVANNAH, GA.

The length of the coast line between Norfolk, Va., and the southern point of Florida is 1,200 miles. Savannah is located midway between these points. Norfolk, Va., is a deep-water port, and its commerce and location warrants such improvements as will accommodate the deepest draft bottoms. Between Norfolk and the southern point of Florida the Federal Government has improved, and is still improving, 10 ports. The improvements have not been carried out to the same extent at each of these ports, and it would not be expected that all of the ports could be improved so as to accommodate the deep-draft bottoms.

There is no question but that at least one port over this 1,200 miles of the coast line should be improved, so as to accommodate vessels that

are increasing in tonnage and draft. The increase in commerce at some of these 10 ports has been notable during the last 10 years. At some of the places there has not been a response in the way of increase in commerce proportional to the expenditure made by the Government.

In the tabulation given below are the names of the ports extending from Norfolk, Va., to Key West, Fla., the total appropriation made by the Government from the commencement of the improvement of each port to June 30, 1915, the value of commerce of each port for the year 1914, and the value of commerce for the year 1904, 10 years previous.

Ports.	Total appropriation made for improvement up to June 30, 1915.	Value of commerce for the year 1914.	Value of commerce for the year 1904.
Key West, Fla.	\$780,330	\$13,434,175	\$5,229,150
Miami, Fla.	665,727	3,197,136	514,710
Jacksonville, Fla.	6,827,809	60,718,452	28,000,000
Fernandina, Fla.	3,647,510	9,230,082	10,715,000
Brunswick, Ga.	1,428,328	38,343,320	29,939,000
Darien, Ga.	175,365	1,450,909	917,240
Savannah, Ga.	10,676,226	349,193,305	193,820,000
Charleston, S. C.	5,095,234	46,800,741	49,994,000
Georgetown, S. C.	3,142,022	4,146,954	9,546,843
Wilmington, N. C.	6,146,168	28,682,162	44,724,500

The figures given in the tabulation were taken from the reports of the Chief of Engineers to the Secretary of War.

From the above tabulation it is observed that the value of commerce, which passed through the port of Savannah, Ga., in 1914, was greater than all of the other nine ports combined by over \$130,000,000, whereas in 1904 the commerce of the port of Savannah while greater than all other of the nine ports combined, was but approximately \$13,000,000 over the total value of commerce of the nine ports for that year. Not only has Savannah responded in the way of commerce for each improvement giving increased depth since first improvement of the harbor, but comparing the commerce with the other ports, it is observed that if any port is worthy of continuing the improvement, as far as response in the growth of commerce is concerned, the port of Savannah should be favorably considered.

On account of the cost in obtaining improvements sufficient to accommodate the largest size bottoms, it can not be expected that the Federal Government can improve all of the ports to meet this condition. As Savannah has well responded as regards increase in commerce to all of the improvements made by the Government, and as there are no physical difficulties in the way of continuing its improvement so as to give a greater depth than now existing, as the Board of Engineers and the Chief of Engineers have indorsed the project whereby a material improvement can be accomplished within reasonable cost, and one which is warranted by prospective increase in commerce, therefore it is urged that favorable action be taken by Congress whereby the recommendation of the Board of Engineers and Chief of Engineers can be adopted.

Since the report was prepared by the district engineer for the new project, several new manufacturing industries have developed at Savannah, one of which is the immense sugar refinery, where an expenditure of approximately \$5,000,000 will be made. Due to this industry alone, it is stated that the Government will receive a large amount in additional duties, perhaps to an extent of \$3,000,000 annually and the commencement of receiving this excessive increase in duty may be expected early in the year of 1917.

In furnishing the above argument, it is not done with the intention of discouraging the Federal Government in making further improvements at any or all of the other ports noted, but only to bring out the fact that anticipating that all of the ports can not be improved to an extent of accommodating the increased tonnage and draft of the deepest bottoms; that your attention be invited to the conditions at Savannah, and to show that of any port on the South Atlantic coast south of Norfolk, Va., Savannah is more worthy than any other port of having continued improvements, so as to obtain an enlarged channel affording passage for increased size freight bottoms.

SAVANNAH, GA., December 8, 1916.

HON. CHARLES G. EDWARDS, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. EDWARDS: About 1 o'clock to-day I received your telegram, and shortly afterwards was called up by the mayor for a conference, as he had received a similar telegram.

In accordance with your request, I am inclosing the statement which I had gotten up to read before the River and Harbor Committee, and I particularly want to call your attention to the matter of the sugar refinery. There is no question but what this \$10,000-a-day duty will be forthcoming, and the chances are it will even be larger, for the management have decided to increase the plant to a 50 per cent increase in the output; so the Government will be recouped inside of two or three years for nearly all the money they have spent so far on this harbor. I shall send a copy of this statement later to Senator SMITH, so that he will be prepared to take care of the bill in the Senate.

We all appreciate your work and what you have done for the Savannah Harbor, and I sincerely hope that you will succeed on this bill as you have in the past as a good wind-up to your work in Congress.

Yours, very truly,

WM. W. WILLIAMSON.

This committee appears before you in the hope of securing your support for the further improvement of the Savannah Harbor. Col. W. C. Langitt's specifications for a depth at mean low water of 26 feet from the Seaboard Air Line Railway bridge to Quarantine, 30 feet from Quarantine to the sea, and the widening of the channel in places, has been approved by the Board of Engineers, the Chief of Engineers, and now comes to you for your consideration. The bill carries an appropriation of \$1,920,000 and covers a period of four years for the work.

We have always understood it to be the policy of your committee to give their approval and support to meritorious projects, such as show a large increase in commerce on the expenditures made. We ask, therefore, your careful attention to the data following, using Government figures, which will show that commerce at Savannah has enormously responded to the greater depth of water.

Statistics on water-borne commerce of Savannah.

Years.	Appropriations.	Expended.	Controlling depth of harbor at mean low water.	Water-borne commerce for calendar year.	For every additional foot in depth attained commerce has increased in one year—	And for the period a commerce of—
From 1874 to June 30, 1885.....	\$882,000	\$831,614.40	1885. 13 to 14 feet.....	1884. \$51,630,518		
From 1885 to June 30, 1905.....	¹ 6,682,983	6,569,323.22	1905. 19 feet.....	1904. 193,820,760	\$28,438,000	\$201,930,693 194,836,773 209,018,494 167,941,267 186,701,147 224,512,440 246,678,077
From 1905 to June 30, 1912.....	² 2,546,764	1,968,639.20	1912. 22 feet.....	1911. 246,678,077	17,619,000	1,431,618,891
From 1912 to June 30, 1916.....	680,000	1,288,663.28	1916. 1915. 420,088,304	43,352,000		296,444,106 360,536,275 349,193,325 420,088,304
Total.....	10,791,747					1,426,262,010
To be deducted from appropriation on Savannah Harbor.....	122,700					
Total.....	10,669,047	10,628,240.10				

¹ Expended on channel between Savannah and Beaufort..... \$106,700² Expended on channel between Savannah and Beaufort..... 16,000

Total..... 122,700

Controlling depth of harbor for 1916 remains practically the same as of 1912, but there has been an advance in the general depth of the harbor.

Owing to the exhaustion of the appropriation, a uniform depth of 26 feet was not attained, and it is to secure this depth to Quarantine and 30 feet to the sea that the present bill is asked for. The tendency is to build larger ships, as they can be operated more economically than smaller ones, proportionately. A large and deep ship starting from Savannah at the top of high water will find that on reaching Quarantine the tide has fallen about 2 feet; hence the necessity for 30 feet from Quarantine to the sea.

Comparing Savannah in 1905 and 1915-16, we give you the following information:

Miscellaneous commercial data.

1905.	
Number of banks and trust companies.....	10
Number of telephone subscribers.....	5,591
Enrollment in public schools.....	6,891
Population.....	75,000
Post-office receipts.....	\$200,540.83
Capital, surplus, and undivided profits of banks and trust companies.....	\$5,059,704.35
Deposits in banks and trust companies.....	\$13,360,638.90
Real and personal property tax returns (66½ per cent).....	\$43,228,682.00
Value of water-borne commerce.....	\$201,931,000.00

1915 AND 1916.	
Number of banks and trust companies, Sept. 1, 1916.....	18
Number of telephone subscribers, Sept. 1, 1916.....	7,726
Enrollment in public schools, Oct. 1, 1916.....	10,008
Population.....	90,000
Post-office receipts, calendar year 1915.....	\$289,320.09
Capital, surplus, and undivided profits of banks and trust companies, Sept. 1, 1916.....	\$10,014,549.00
Deposits in banks and trust companies, estimated, 1916.....	\$30,000,000.00
Real and personal property tax returns (66½ per cent) calendar year 1915.....	\$58,063,392.00
Value of water-borne commerce, calendar year 1915.....	\$420,088,304.00

We believe that Savannah has a great future. It has the largest cottonseed oil refinery in the world; it is one of the leading cities of the world in the manufacture and shipment of commercial fertilizer. Savannah vied with New Orleans as the second cotton port, one year New Orleans beating Savannah by a few thousand bales and the next year Savannah beating New Orleans. The result depends largely upon the size of the crop in the contiguous territory.

Many improvements of magnitude are now under way or in contemplation on the river front. A sugar refinery, which is nearing completion and which will handle 1,000,000 pounds of sugar daily, will pay the Government a duty of \$10,000 per day, or approximately \$3,000,000 annually thus recouping the Government in four years for the total expenditure at Savannah, including the present amount asked for. The Savannah Warehouse & Compress Co. is just being completed at a cost of almost \$1,000,000. It will supply a long-felt want, relieving the congestion that has occurred annually. A large barrel factory and a pulp factory are also in course of construction. Several other large enterprises are projected, but for the present can not be disclosed.

Approximately 6 miles of utilized wharf front affords shipping accommodations unsurpassed south of Baltimore; one slip has a length of 2,005 feet.

The connections at Savannah's terminals by rail and water are unsurpassed. Owing to the curvature in the coast, Savannah is nearer to Omaha, Kansas City, St. Louis, Memphis, Nashville, and other western cities than either New York, Philadelphia, or Baltimore. The connections by rail embrace all the most important roads in the Southeast and include the Seaboard Air Line Railway, Atlantic Coast Line Railway, Central of Georgia Railway, Southern Railway, Savannah & Statesboro Railway, Savannah & Northwestern Railway, and the

Midland Railway. With these rail lines and their connections, Savannah serves both as a port of import and export for a very large territory, extending to Missouri, Kansas, Oklahoma, Kentucky, and Tennessee.

COASTWISE STEAMERS.

The Ocean Steamship Co. sail: Three steamers a week for New York; two steamers a week for Boston.

The Merchants & Miners' Transportation Co. sail: Two steamers a week for Baltimore; two steamers a week for Philadelphia.

The large increase in water-borne commerce is not due to the handling of munitions, for with the exception of steel billets and pig iron Savannah has handled little else in this line; but in spite of this her commerce has expanded, whilst that of neighboring ports has declined, as will be seen from the subjoined table:

Expansion of Savannah's commerce compared with other ports.

	Valuation, 1913.	Valuation, 1915.
Savannah, Ga.....	\$360,536,275	\$420,088,304
New Orleans, La.....	315,082,532	368,522,285
Boston, Mass.....	208,824,704	296,195,076
Wilmington, N. C.....	46,736,713	46,638,401
Charleston, S. C.....	79,225,772	57,394,658
Brunswick, Ga.....	58,258,725	44,675,521
Jacksonville, Fla.....	71,244,326	61,022,944
Fernandina, Fla.....	9,697,281	2,732,197
Tampa, Fla.....	50,480,000	44,319,230
Pensacola, Fla.....	36,573,434	23,095,884
Mobile, Ala.....	61,368,688	46,440,771
	413,584,939	326,319,609

Rank of principal ports of the United States in foreign exports of domestic and foreign merchandise.

	1910	1912	1914 (revised custom districts).
Atlantic coast:			
New York.....	\$651,986,356	\$817,945,803	\$864,546,338
Savannah.....	63,428,155	104,286,925	110,594,981
Baltimore.....	77,381,507	92,210,877	109,690,231
Boston and Charlestown.....	70,516,789	69,092,171	65,715,181
Philadelphia.....	73,296,343	69,099,730	65,182,514
Norfolk.....	8,155,818	11,998,504	25,025,255
Wilmington.....	20,922,398	28,705,448	25,870,851
Charleston.....	8,104,821	12,423,035	20,829,302
Jacksonville.....	2,391,090	2,329,322	(¹)
Gulf coast:			
Tampa.....	4,395,972	4,409,640	41,838,924
Mobile.....	27,526,245	31,230,117	50,805,641
New Orleans.....	140,378,580	149,160,910	193,839,961
Galveston.....	173,178,992	218,146,097	255,767,908
Pacific coast:			
San Francisco.....	31,180,760	49,249,734	63,374,903

¹ Changed to Tampa, Fla.

The United States Government has spent to date \$10,699,364.91 on the improvement of Savannah Harbor. These expenditures for construction and maintenance when read in their totalities seem large,

but the gratifying increase in commerce with the improvements gives at once a justification of past work and future growth of the port.

The growth of foreign exports at Savannah as compared with the leading ports of the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts can be better illustrated by the following figures, compiled from the records of the United States Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce:

Comparison of foreign exports with the leading ports of the Atlantic coast.

	Per cent.
1884 to 1904, inclusive:	
Savannah, gain	170
New York, gain	53½
Boston, gain	41½
Baltimore, gain	92
Philadelphia, gain	95½
1904 to 1914, inclusive:	
Savannah, gain	105½
New York, gain	70½
Boston, loss	26½
Baltimore, gain	32½
Philadelphia, loss	8½

RECAPITULATION.

1884 to 1914, inclusive:	
Savannah, gain	454½
New York, gain	162½
Boston, gain	3½
Baltimore, gain	154½
Philadelphia, gain	78½

The Clerk read as follows:

Red River, Ark. and La.: For maintenance below Fulton, Ark., \$55,000.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee [Mr. SPARKMAN] for some information just at this point. I notice that the item just read carries \$55,000 for the maintenance of the Red River below Fulton, Ark., to the mouth of the Red River in Louisiana. The rivers and harbors appropriation bill usually carries an appropriation for the maintenance of the Red River in the way of keeping the channel open and free from accumulated drifts in Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Texas from Fulton, Ark., to the mouth of the Washita River, in Oklahoma, and in reading through the bill I find that item has been omitted this year. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee the reason for that omission. I presume that the reason for it is that the report of the Army engineers shows a sufficient amount of money on hand to continue the work as it has been carried on in the past, without an additional appropriation at this time, and if such is the fact, I would like to have that information.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I will say in response to the gentleman's inquiry that the report shows just that condition. It reads as follows:

Proposed operations: The funds available will be expended substantially as follows: (a) About \$25,000 in the repair of levees destroyed by overflows in 1915 and 1916; (b) the remainder in caring for the Government snag boats *Denison* and *C. A. Culberson* and quarter boat No. 3 at a cost of about \$500 per month, and in two trips of the *Denison* of about six months each at about \$1,500 per month for necessary work of preventing the formation of rafts. The available funds will be exhausted about June 30, 1918. No estimate for the fiscal year ending on that date is therefore submitted.

Mr. BLACK. Then I understand that the funds now on hand will run until near the end of the fiscal year 1918, in so far as relates to the present operations, and that will be at the end of the period for which this bill makes appropriations?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is the idea, as I understand it.

Mr. BLACK. That was all that I wanted to say in reference to the item at this time.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 23, strike out lines 12 and 13.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment to strike out the paragraph for the expenditure of \$55,000 for the maintenance of the Red River below Fulton. I am very much pleased to think that I was able to help my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] on the preceding item, although we failed to strike out a project which has water in the river only one month in the year, according to the official report; but, as some one suggests, perhaps in the future artesian wells may be placed there.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. What month of the year is it that the water is in the river?

Mr. FREAR. It is some time between January and June, but the report says that it would be of no practical benefit, because at that time there are no agricultural products to float.

Mr. MADDEN. If there is nothing more definite than between January and June one would not know when to bring his boats there.

Mr. FREAR. That is the difficulty exactly. Mr. Chairman, the Red River has received \$2,874,687 thus far below Fulton. There are \$88,221 on hand and \$55,000 more is asked for at this time. Last year we expended something like \$65,000. The Engineer's report, on page 1007, says:

A transportation company has been organized to operate a line of boats, and it proposes to begin regular trips in the near future.

We have expended \$2,874,687 on this river, and we are now told that a boat line may possibly be organized some time in the future. The commerce last year reached 27,325 tons, of which timber reached 9,000 tons and sand and gravel 4,000 tons, leaving a net balance of 14,275 tons hauled 35 miles, which is the net result of an investment of nearly \$3,000,000 in the Red River, according to the official report.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, the present traffic on the Red River is no index to the character of the stream. The reason that a new barge line and steamboats are to be placed in the river is because of the fact that at the last session of our State legislature there was an amendment provided to be submitted to the people of Louisiana, and that amendment was submitted in November of last year, allowing the State to levy a special tax for the establishment of a barge line. This became necessary in reference to the Red River, and this will apply particularly and almost exclusively to the Red River, because of the fact that the appropriations in the last few years have not been adequate to clear the entire river of logs and snags. The Red River is one of the greatest navigable streams in the United States. It is over 1,200 miles long and there are 600 miles of navigable stream, and it has been navigated for over 50 years. A great portion of this money appropriated was for the purpose of taking a raft out of the river many miles long, which had prevented the navigation of the river and which caused all that section of land to be overflowed, and it took a large amount of money to remove that raft.

After this raft was removed and they began actually to navigate the river it was navigable for a long number of years, and it finally happened they made such small amounts of appropriation for a few sessions of Congress that the engineers were not enabled to take all the snags out of the river and they began to knock the bottom out of the boats plying up and down the river. Navigation was simply suspended temporarily for the purpose of enabling the people to readjust themselves to the changed conditions. The new navigation company has been organized, provision for the barges has been made, and everything is in shape to carry out the regulations for the traffic up and down the river on this barge line, which is going to be inaugurated on a very extensive scale. A large part of the river is already being navigated not throughout its length from the Mississippi to Fulton, Ark., as heretofore, but up and down the river, and that is many miles, as shown by the report of the engineers.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BUTLER. How long is the river?

Mr. WATKINS. One thousand two hundred and seventy-five miles.

Mr. BUTLER. How wide is it?

Mr. WATKINS. It averages about 100 yards—300 feet.

Mr. BUTLER. How deep is it?

Mr. WATKINS. At Shreveport, practically the head of navigation, 32 feet.

Mr. BUTLER. I am very much obliged to the gentleman. The gentleman thinks they would have more water in it if it were not so long. [Laughter.]

Mr. WATKINS. Well, I will just say, "So long."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Waterway on the coast of Texas: For maintenance of the West Galveston Bay-Brazos River section, \$15,000; for maintenance of the Brazos River-Matagorda Bay section, \$30,000; for maintenance of the Aransas Pass-Pass Cavallo section, \$30,000: *Provided*, That any portion of the amount herein or hereafter appropriated for a given section of said waterway may, upon recommendation of the Chief of Engineers, be transferred by the Secretary of War and made available for maintenance of improvement in any other section; in all, \$75,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph, lines 4 to 13, inclusive.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 24, by striking out the paragraph beginning with line 4 and ending with line 13.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to read the records of the Army engineers contained in the report in this case. Let me say I am only taking a few items which I have checked over, because unless they have a different relation to other items there is no object in continual repetition; but this is different from

the others, as was the last, which was the case of having paid \$2,800,000 for a river and finding as a result of our investment 14,000 tons of freight hauled 35 miles. Now, there is a different situation here. We have put in about \$1,000,000, in round figures, on this project, and here is what I wish to call to the attention of the committee: They have a waterway organization down in Texas, and a very strong one, I believe, with a gentleman by the name of Mr. Holland at the head of it, who, I think, is regarded as a very able and intelligent man by all the papers that have come to us. Here is what he says about this particular project, and it is for the advice of the committee that I am reading. It appeared in the Houston Post, November 6, a year ago. He says:

It is not the appropriations that cause the rivers and harbors bill to be called "pork barrel," but the manner of making the appropriations. For instance, it is no secret that the intercoastal canal at a depth of 5 feet does not meet the demands of the lightest draft navigation for boats and barges—

Mind you, he says "lightest draft"—

Nothing less than 9 feet will make a waterway that will meet the demands of commerce—but we have proceeded on the theory that it is easier to secure the smaller appropriations and have accepted a minimum of 5 feet with the belief that it could be easily deepened to 9 feet by additional appropriations. However, when the first and second appropriations are added together it will cost the Government more than twice as much as it would have cost had the original appropriation been made on the basis of 9 feet. Penny-wise and pound-foolish is what I call it, and unless these practices cease we will never have a good Government. The time for decisive action is here; the time for half-hearted pleading is past. We ask for appropriations for a real waterway of 9 feet minimum depth, not for a makeshift of 5 feet depth.

Then, as an afterthought, he has a genuine inspiration and says:

The fact is that an inland waterway from Maine to Mexico, with a minimum depth of 12 feet, is an actual necessity for the protection of the country.

There is a statement from which it appears that this expenditure of money does not meet navigation needs for the lightest draft vessels, and it is evident from the report when you stop to read the commerce which does not reach a thousand tons. Now, it seems to me that it is a waste of money after having expended nearly a million dollars without getting any result, and it would seem wise to save that \$75,000 for the future needs of the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Colorado River, Tex.: Completing improvement in accordance with the report printed in Rivers and Harbors Committee Document No. 3, Sixty-third Congress, first session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document, \$25,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, strike out lines 1 to 5, inclusive.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, this is somewhat different from the Sabine River and others, and I wish to read from the official report with reference to it. On page 11 the district officer comes to this conclusion. He says:

In view of the difficulty of improving the river between mile 21 and Bay City I would recommend that the improvement of this section be not undertaken for the present, but that the part of the river from a connection with the Intercoastal Canal in Matagorda Bay to mile 21 in the river be improved at a cost of \$25,000.

The section I read a few moments ago was where they stated the canal is practically valueless and they could not use it, and that boats of the lightest draft will not run on that waterway, and unless there is some further money appropriated it is useless to put this money in. So unless there is something further to offer it is useless to put this money into that river. On page 7 the division engineer says:

The division engineer, however, can not join in the recommendation that the river is worthy of improvement to mile 21 at the present time—

He overrules the district engineer—

There is practically nothing upon this portion of the Colorado River to originate a commerce, and the conditions along this portion of the river at the present time are such as would render any local commerce difficult.

And then on page 3 the report says:

It appears, however, that there are only about a half dozen farms now in operation in the immediate vicinity of the river below mile 21. It is not seen how local commerce of any magnitude can originate for some time to come, and it is not thought that through commerce via the present intracoastal waterway would seek an outlet at this point.

Of course it can not, if that previous report which I read is true—

The board therefore reports in its opinion it is not advisable for the United States to undertake any improvement of this stream at the present time.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. In just a moment. The Chief of Engineers reached the conclusion that because of this Intercoastal Canal, which will not permit a boat of the lightest draft to carry freight, according to the statement, that this creek ought to have this amount of money because of this Intercoastal Canal there; and he reports and recommends that this \$25,000 be permitted, overruling the Board of Engineers.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the committee has reported in favor of improving this stream against the advice of the engineers?

Mr. FREAR. The Chief of Engineers overruled the Board of Engineers, who give all the reasons why the river is not capable of any possible commercial use; but the Chief of Engineers simply overruled them and wiped out their judgment, so to speak.

Mr. BUTLER. I am hunting for a precedent. I have a few creeks in my corner of the State, and I am looking up precedents. I have not gotten any yet.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to read as follows:

I concur in general with the district officer and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in the opinion that for the section of river from mile 21 to Bay City the benefits to be derived from the improvements are not commensurate with the expense that would be entailed, and it is therefore considered that this section is not worthy of improvement by the Government at the present time. For the section from a connection with the Intercoastal Canal in Matagorda Bay to mile 21 in the river I concur with the district officer in the opinion that the improvement can be made at a reasonable cost in comparison with the benefits derived; and in view of the offers of local cooperation as to bridges and terminal facilities, I recommend that the locality be improved by the United States to the extent of redredging a channel 5 feet deep and 40 feet wide across the bar at the mouth and snagging, removing remains of old rafts, and cutting overhanging timber from the mouth to mile 21, at a total estimated cost of \$25,000, on condition that the improvement be not undertaken until after the construction of a railroad spur to some point at or near mile 21, and a public wharf on each side of the river at this place, with public roads leading thereto, and suitable bridge draws in the bridges below mile 21, satisfactory to the Chief of Engineers and to the Secretary of War, all free of expense to the United States.

That is the total expense that this Government has had, namely, \$25,000; and the local authorities will be at much more expense than that. I submit that the appropriation ought to be granted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Arkansas River, Ark. and Okla.: For maintenance by snagging operations, \$35,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Some time ago the president of the Mississippi River Commission, Col. Townsend, who is a recognized authority on the subject of the Mississippi Valley, in view of the waste that had occurred in this valley through money placed in these rivers, made the following recommendation before a waterway organization in this city, wherein he said:

Specifically, the writer would not abandon any navigable stream in the Mississippi Valley that has been partially improved, but would leave 58 of them in statu quo, confining operations to snagging and the maintenance of existing works, and would concentrate appropriations on opening up a channel of the capacity of that existing on the lower middle Mississippi to Chicago and Pittsburgh.

If the facilities thus afforded by the Government are utilized, the upper Mississippi and the Missouri River should then receive attention.

Now, I speak of that at this time because it will be referred to hereafter, that here is one of the best authorities in the country, who advises us to stop throwing money away.

Mr. Chairman, I moved to strike out the last word. How much have we put in these streams? Let us see. On the Ouachita River, which we have just passed, over \$4,212,869, with a balance of \$672,000 on hand, and we just passed an item of \$10,000 more. What is the commerce? It floated 97,000 tons last year. Timber barged, 36,000 tons; staves, 6,000; sand and gravel, 8,000; all for an investment of \$4,212,000.

Mr. Chairman, I made a pro forma amendment. Take the Arkansas, and we have here \$3,323,336, and on hand \$300,499. The commerce is 39,996 tons—logs, 20,713; bolts, 2,550; brush, 4,560; hauled 2 miles; total 27,823, or a net commerce on the Arkansas River of 12,143 tons, on an investment of over \$3,000,000. Why, Mr. Chairman, think of the figures we are reaching. Think of the cost to the Government. What is it? Ten, twenty, thirty, or fifty dollars per ton, for maintenance, in addition to the interest charges on that amount.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I understand the amendment applies to the Ouachita River.

Mr. FREAR. I refer to that so as not to take any more time. I moved to strike out the last word. I made a pro forma amendment in order to discuss the two items.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, the Arkansas River was taken over, or adopted, by Congress, according to my recollection, in 1879. It has been provided for, I think, in every river and harbor bill from that time until now.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] does not seem to be well posted as to what may be found in the reaches of the river and the commercial value of the tonnage. I read from the report of the Engineers, in Document No. 461, House of Representatives, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, relating to the upper reaches of the river between Little Rock and Fort Smith. The engineer says:

I have not available an analysis of the freight movement in the Arkansas Valley from which to determine the quantity that would be affected by dependable transportation lines on the Arkansas River. In the report upon the examination of the river between Little Rock and Ozark this was given as 608,000 tons for that 144 miles of river. Of this quantity 400,000 tons was coal.

I would like to say to the House that the coal referred to is anthracite, which is being used to-day, as I have been told, on our battleships. It is not so good as the Pittsburgh anthracite, but it is a hard coal and a great steam producer.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. When did the Government buy that coal for the battleships? I am pleased that the Government did so. But when?

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. I have no information as to that. I read further:

By using this as a basis, the assumption may be made that the total tonnage of freights that would be affected by dependable transportation lines on the Arkansas River from its mouth to Muskogee and Fort Gibson would be 675,000 tons of general freights and 600,000 tons of coal, making a total of 1,275,000 tons.

Now, this is in the upper stretch of the river from Little Rock to Fort Smith and into Oklahoma. If you leave Little Rock going south down toward the Mississippi River, this river traverses one of the richest valleys in the world. Little Rock is the capital of Arkansas. This past year there were over 200,000 bales of cotton shipped out of Little Rock alone. Lying across the river on the eastern side is the great county of Lonoke, the home county of Senator ROBINSON, and is in the district I represent. This county is a great county for the production of cotton and rice. This county borders on this river. When you come down to my home county of Jefferson, which I believe is one of the richest bodies of land in the world, you find that last year this county, which is split wide open by this river, produced, I am told, about 73,000 bales of cotton. A bale of cotton weighs, you know, about 500 pounds, and that cotton averaged 25 cents a pound last fall, and I saw some of it selling for 35 cents a pound. Pine Bluff, my home, is the capital city of this county, situated on the bank of the Arkansas River. This city handled this cotton season 150,000 bales of cotton.

Now, leaving my county, on the other side is Arkansas County, lying on the other side of this river. This is a great prairie county. Our friends from Missouri, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, and Nebraska came down to these lands and discovered that they were adapted to the production of rice. This last year they produced there one and one-half million bushels of rice, which sold for \$1.05 a bushel. All this traffic can be done by this river.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Yes.

Mr. FESS. About what is the supply of the anthracite coal?

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. I can not say, except what this report says. This coal region is above me and above my district.

Mr. FESS. I was simply asking for information.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. I understand the supply is inexhaustible.

Mr. FESS. Is it genuine anthracite?

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. It is good anthracite, with very little dross.

Now, down through Lincoln and Desha Counties the same condition exists with reference to commercial values.

Mr. Chairman, the source of this river is in Colorado. It comes down from the State of Colorado and through portions of Kansas and into Oklahoma, and splits the State of Arkansas wide open in the middle. At one time I saw this river measured by the engineers and it disclosed a depth of 70 feet. There are plying in the river to-day below Little Rock two or three boats that are doing good business. We have two snag and dredge boats in the river, owned by the Government.

Now, the last report that was made touching this river you will find on page 901 of the Report of the Chief of Engineers for 1914, House Document No. 461, and in that report it is said

that the amount that can be profitably expended in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, for maintenance of improvement is \$237,500.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Yes; I yield to my committee colleague.

Mr. SWITZER. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the expensive improvement in the past is what was referred to by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR]. That part of the improvement has been abandoned, has it not? This item is merely for the maintenance of the stream as it originally existed, is it not?

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. The gentleman is correct, except that the improvement of the river has not been abandoned. It is for snagging and the maintenance of the stream.

Mr. SWITZER. The principal improvement that the gentleman from Wisconsin referred to was recommended to be abandoned by the United States Engineers, and it was abandoned, but it should not be dragged in here to the prejudice of this item.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. No. I do not quite agree with the gentleman.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. I am interested in the question of how much the Government has expended on it.

Mr. SWITZER. It should not be brought in in connection with this item.

Mr. BUTLER. How much has the Government lost on this project?

Mr. SWITZER. It is just like the coal business or any other business. Sometimes a coal mine pays, and sometimes it does not. It is the same with respect to a river project. Sometimes river projects fail, but that is no reason for stopping the policy of the improvement of rivers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Now, Mr. Chairman, my friend from Ohio [Mr. SWITZER] refers to the recommendation of abandonment. He is mistaken about that. Here is the report of the engineer on that feature of the case. He says that he is of the opinion that the improvement of the Arkansas River should not be abandoned, but is inclined to the belief that the work of retreating the banks should be continued. He says the commercial importance of the river is increasing all the time, and that is natural under an increase of population. The population of the great State of Arkansas through which this river runs has increased every year since its admission to the Union. The lands are being cleared, and where lands along this river were worth \$15 to \$25 an acre formerly, they are worth to-day \$80 to \$100 an acre. Do not be misled by anything that has been said. The bill only carries \$35,000 for the maintenance of the river in the way of snagging and maintenance. [Applause.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, let me say in response to what the gentleman from Arkansas has stated, that the \$35,000 appropriation is made in accordance with the recommendation of the engineers themselves; they recommended a modification of the project and an appropriation of \$35,000 for the purpose of putting into effect that modification.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Arkansas River, Ark. and Okla.: For maintenance by snagging operations, \$35,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do this not for the purpose of consuming time but to continue the discussion and show how mistaken we sometimes are in reference to these things. The Arkansas River received last year \$209,000 instead of \$35,000, which it carries for this year, and we are carrying on improvements now. The Arkansas has \$309,000 to its credit in the Treasury, or did have at the end of the last fiscal year. I concede that this is only for maintenance, but we are carrying on the improvement notwithstanding the Board of Army Engineers recommended the abandonment except for the maintenance of snagging and the construction of a snag boat. That is all stated in House Document 461, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session.

Mr. SPARKMAN. They recommended that the existing project be modified and not abandoned as the gentleman says. There is quite a difference between the modification and abandonment of a project, and I just wanted to make the distinction clear, otherwise it might give the public the impression that we were going contrary to the recommendations of the engineers, whereas the reverse is true. They have recommended not the abandonment of the project but a modification of it.

Mr. FREAR. Is it not true that the amendment was put on in the Senate and was refused by our committee?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Oh, that has nothing to do with our action to-day. I am not looking backward; I am looking to the future. They recommended that the existing project be modified so as to limit the work to snagging the river, from it to the mouth of the Neosho, and it is in accordance with that recommendation that this \$35,000 is appropriated.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, we have put in \$3,823,336 on that river, and they said that when the improvement was completed the river would be in splendid condition to carry coal. Now, the total commerce was 39,966 tons last year, and taking out the sand and gravel and timber it would leave about 16,000 tons, and that included 1,200 tons of coal that was hauled 20 miles. That was the original proposition, that when we had put in \$3,000,000 into the Arkansas River it was to be made a great coal-carrying stream. The same was true of the Big Sandy, where we hauled 12 tons of coal year before last for Government purposes after an expenditure of between \$1,000,000 and \$2,000,000. They said that there were 800,000,000 tons of coal tributary to this river, and we find that while 900,000 tons of coal were shipped by rail out of the territory in 1914, only 2,716 tons were shipped 7 miles by water; that was two years ago. That shows that we are continually engaged in pursuing rainbow promises and prospects not realized, and when there is such a tremendous amount of expenditure being urged upon the committee it is important that we should retrench.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, I do not see why there should be so much criticism of the engineers because some projects that they recommended for the Arkansas River a number of years ago, after the expenditure of a few million dollars, are concluded to be failures and their abandonment recommended. Engineers are not, of course, infallible. If eight or ten million dollars had been expended on experimental work on some harbor where it afterwards failed to develop a large amount of commerce, and there had been a failure you would hear nothing of criticism. We have spent on the mouth of the Mississippi River, on the South Pass, more than \$10,000,000. What are we doing to-day? Why, we are digging the Southwest Pass and have expended on that something like \$10,000,000. Why? Because they found that the South Pass is deteriorating and unless we spend millions more on the South Pass, which they do not believe would be wise, it is going to close up several miles at the mouth and there would be no navigable outlet for the stream. But because it costs a large amount of money there is no reason for our abandoning river and harbor improvement. The mouth of the Mississippi River near the city of New Orleans has a tonnage of 6,000,000 or 7,000,000 annually valued at more than \$350,000,000, as large as the port of Duluth and Superior, that my friend from Wisconsin is generally talking about.

What I am calling the attention of the committee to is that there are a number of large harbors, and I see some in the bill, where we have expended thousands and millions of dollars in experimental work and which the engineers can not tell until after they have tried out the proposition what the result will be. You have to expend money in experimentation, and because a few hundred thousand dollars has been wasted in experimentation on our rivers, is no reason why you should condemn the whole policy. After it has been demonstrated that this work will not result in any great benefit as a national project the engineers recommend the abandonment of the Arkansas River, and we followed it. All we have appropriated for in this bill is enough money to keep the channel in the condition it was before we undertook the new improvement which was abandoned.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWITZER. Certainly.

Mr. TILSON. Has the gentleman in mind the point on the river where they have abandoned the project?

Mr. SWITZER. They have abandoned that project, and this appropriation is to take the snags out of the river to keep the original channel open to the Mississippi River.

Mr. TILSON. Does the gentleman know where the head of navigation now is after the abandonment?

Mr. SWITZER. I do not know.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to supplement briefly the appropriate remarks of the gentleman from Ohio. The gentleman from Wisconsin referred to the condition of this

river and its commerce. I assume that his efforts were to show that the original project for the improvement of the river was still in force. He did not mention in the slightest way that the engineers under the authority of section 14 of the act of 1915 had made a reexamination of this stream and had recommended that the original project had been modified to the extent of abandoning the improvement, and that further we were only to continue snagging, and they recommended an appropriation of \$35,000 for that purpose.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The last river and harbor bill authorized a new survey for the purpose of examining the entire stream. That report has not come in and of course we can not tell what the engineers may do. At present we are only trying to carry out the recommendation for the modification.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, any gentleman who discusses an item in an important bill like this ought to give all of the facts bearing upon the contention which he makes. When he tells only part of the truth and withholds a part, certainly he can not escape criticism of his candor and his genuine desire to inform the House of what is the truth. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] has a habit in discussing these rivers and harbors appropriations of citing to the House disjointed statements in the report and avoiding everything which is favorable as a rule, and asking the House to reach a conclusion based only upon a partial statement of the facts. These facts either through a press agency which he maintains or otherwise are given to the press and the impression is sought to be made that they represent the truth as to these projects. Such is not the fact, and I entertain the hope, though it may be vain, that this statement which I make may have the same publicity as these partial statements of the truth which he has made many times in discussing this rivers and harbors bill, and if it has that same publicity I shall be very happy. I do say, and I repeat it, that any Member who seeks to maintain the confidence of this House and the country in discussing any proposition before this House owes it to himself and to his colleagues and the country when making a statement to tell all of the truth and not confine himself to partial and disjointed statements which do not represent all of the truth.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, and I would like now to invite particularly the attention of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR]. In the colloquy between he and I on Tuesday, as appears on page 1872 of the RECORD, if he used the words "new projects," I clearly misunderstood the statement of the gentleman and I desire to state in that connection that on the 21st day of December, 1916, before the question of new projects had been decided by the committee, I wrote a letter to the President of the United States, from which I shall quote a brief paragraph:

I do not feel that I could conscientiously vote for another rivers and harbors bill appropriating \$30,000,000 for the further improvement and upkeep of old projects, some of which have become obsolete, while others are not, in my opinion, worthy, and ignore such pressing needs as those detailed above.

The items "detailed above" refer to a concise statement of the various new projects reported by the Chief of Engineers in New York Harbor and its tributaries and New York State. That letter was printed in full in various New York papers, including the New York Sun, of January 2, 1917, and I desire to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing that article therein. If that is the article to which the gentleman referred, I want to say to him that I stand by that article and the statement in that letter.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I was just going to say that that was my impression, but I could not say positively. I thank the gentleman because we are both agreed on that statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The article referred to is as follows:

NEW YORK PROTESTS TO WILSON ON PORK—REPRESENTATIVE HULBERT URGES PRESIDENT TO ADVOCATE HARBOR PROJECTS HERE—TELLS OF UNITED STATES WASTE—COUNTRY'S GREATEST FORT NEGLECTED AND MONEY SQUANDERED IN OTHER PLACES.

Indignation at the pork appropriations of the rivers and harbors bill, which will authorize the expenditure of \$30,000,000 on improvements mostly of local value in the South, while less than 2 per cent is appropriated to aid in the development of New York Harbor, the gateway to 50 per cent of the Nation's commerce, has caused GEORGE MURRAY HULBERT, Representative from the twenty-first district of New York, to send a vigorous protest to President Wilson.

Under the system of appropriating money for the improvement of rivers and harbors, Representative HULBERT pointed out yesterday, most of this year's funds will go to carry on what are known as continued projects, many of which he says are of doubtful value. The military value of the East River, which if deepened would give the

United States what would amount to a Kiel Canal and make a blockade almost impossible. The commercial advantages to be derived from ridding the Hudson of the shoals which render valueless the city's \$1,800,000 1,000-foot piers have all passed over the heads of the rivers and harbors committeemen, who apparently have more faith in the advantages to be gained by making improvements of local advantage in the South.

The whole present scheme of river and harbor improvement is wrong, Representative HULBERT believes.

"When the Army engineers have surveyed a project and approved it," he said, "only enough money is appropriated to carry on the work for a short time to get it under way. This causes delays and years when the construction halts altogether, and an inevitable wastage and general inefficiency result. Why, some improvement work has dragged on so long under the present archaic system that before the work was anywhere near completed it was abandoned, because it was seen that it had been overtaken and passed by modern needs. You can imagine how many millions this has cost the country."

NO BACKING FROM NEW YORK.

"It is easy to understand how the South gets these appropriations and just as easy to understand why New York does not. For years New York did not have representation on the Rivers and Harbors Committee; the southerners dominated it. When they wanted a thing they had the solid backing of their communities, while New Yorkers are too much interested in other things to give their Representatives the necessary driving power to get a thing through. That is why it takes years to get an appropriation to make the rivers navigable for the deep-draft ships that bring billions into the port of New York."

"Why, when a hearing was granted on this East River project—unfortunately it was on Lincoln's Birthday—I sent telegrams to the mayor, to business organizations, to various public officials and men interested in the development of the water front, and how many do you think showed up to get what they had been clamoring for? Not one. My only two witnesses were Admiral Benson and Col. Black."

"When the reclamation bill for the South came up I had telegrams and letters from banks and business men of all kinds in the city urging me to vote for it. Why? Because their correspondents in southern cities were for it to a man and demanded action. They are getting it."

RIVER SHOULD EASE CONGESTION.

"The people of New York have been talking about traffic congestion and figures have been offered to show that a person is killed in the streets every 12 hours and one injured every 24 minutes. Did they ever stop to think that nothing would aid in relieving the congestion of New York as much as the improvement of the East River from Third Street to Forty-second Street, so that the boats from Boston, Maine, and other eastern points could unload and load their cargoes at a point away from the points of congestion down town? Now, all that freight is landed there where the island is narrowest and then trucked through the city."

In his letter to the President, Mr. HULBERT says:

"DECEMBER 21, 1916.

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Less than 2 per cent of the \$30,000,000 which the proposed rivers and harbors bill will carry is appropriated for the great harbor of New York and its tributaries."

"The improvement of the East River, under an antiquated plan adopted in 1868, was suspended 'as economically inadvisable' in 1912 when the project was only 63 per cent completed."

"No further appropriation can be made until the 35-foot channel recommended by the Secretary of War in 1912 is adopted as a new project."

"Meanwhile the commerce upon this 16-mile strait has increased in value from \$1,500,000,000 in 1914 to over \$4,000,000,000 in 1915, and I am reliably informed has further greatly increased in 1916."

NEW YORK'S NEW PIER.

"On the Hudson River the city of New York has recently constructed a new 1,000-foot pier and deepened the adjacent slips to 40 feet at Forty-fifth Street, and has planned the construction of other piers with a view to accommodating the largest transatlantic liners at this point instead of at Twenty-third Street, where the river is much narrower."

"But from Thirty-third Street to Fifty-sixth street there is a shoal on the Manhattan side of the river, over which approximately only 22 feet of water obtains, so that the pier already erected and the others to be constructed will not be available for the purpose intended until this shoal is removed."

"No appropriation can be made therefore until the adoption of the new project which has been recommended by the Secretary of War."

"Admiral Benson recently testified to the difficulties of navigating the U. S. S. *Utah* up the East River to the Brooklyn Navy Yard; that vessel is about 540 feet long."

"Battle cruisers authorized by the last naval appropriation bill will have a length of between 800 and 900 feet."

"Admiral Benson strenuously urges the improvement of Buttermilk Channel, separating Governors Island from the Brooklyn shore, recommended by the Secretary of War May 3, 1913."

NEW PROJECT MUST BE ADOPTED.

"But no appropriation can be made for this improvement until the adoption of the new project as recommended."

"In the same way, I might demonstrate the urgent necessity of taking on 'Upper Bay opposite Anchorage' recommended by the Secretary of War January 10, 1914; 'Craven Shoal,' recommended January 12, 1916; 'channel between Staten Island Sound and Hoffman Island,' recommended January 25, 1916; 'Bay Ridge and Red Hook Channel,' recommended March 25, 1914; 'Newtown Creek' (commerce valued at \$150,000,000), recommended March 22, 1916; 'Westchester Creek' (commerce valued at \$500,000), recommended December 10, 1915."

"The State of New York has constructed a Barge Canal at an expense of \$160,000,000. The Secretary of War recommended two improvements in connection therewith, viz, Harlem or Bronx Kills (1902) and the Narrows of Lake Champlain in 1913."

"Boats passing through the Harlem River to the Barge Canal terminus on Long Island must pass through Hell Gate. The Harlem Kills improvement would shorten the distance more than 5 miles and avoid the dangers and relieve the congestion in Hell Gate."

"Boats operating on the State Barge Canal, Champlain division, can not pass the Narrows (14 miles long), and freight to and from points on Lake Champlain and the St. Lawrence must be transferred at Whitehall."

OTHER IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED.

"No appropriations for these improvements can be made until the new projects recommended have been adopted."

"Ogdensburg Harbor is another imperative improvement. It is scarcely conceivable that it has a commerce valued at \$50,000,000 per annum. There is also maintained at this point the only all-year ferry service to Canada west of Montreal."

"I do not feel that I could conscientiously vote for another rivers and harbors bill appropriating \$30,000,000 for the further improvement and upkeep of old projects, some of which have become obsolete, while others are not in my opinion worthy, and ignore such pressing needs as those detailed above."

"It certainly does not seem to me to be equitable that only 2 per cent of the appropriation should be applied to the improvement of the harbor and its tributaries which accommodate more than 50 per cent of the commerce of the Nation."

"I hope, Mr. President, you will favor the adoption of such new projects as are imperatively needed and urge the inclusion of the New York Harbor items, inasmuch as they are national in character."

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of presenting to the committee in all fairness the weight of the argument offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL], who, if his side of the House is successful in the next Congress in organizing the House, will be the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. I do not suppose that the gentleman could have followed the argument when he was criticizing my report in the original talk we had upon the floor. I agree with the gentleman that any man who seeks to mislead this House has no right to the confidence of the House. I have given you here the money that has been expended on the Arkansas River. I have given you the money that has been expended on the Washita River, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWITZER] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] agree as to its abandonment or modification. I explained what little commerce has resulted. Let us see what he says in all fairness and his desire to take advantage of one who is seeking here alone on the floor of this House to expose waste in this bill. He, with others, continually jumps into the breach so as to show his indignation. Let us see what he said. I call on the RECORD. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HULBERT] agrees now that my statement was right in regard to himself. I would not misrepresent a single person or project on the floor of the House. There is nothing to gain by it. It is purely a question of project and not a question of personality. I speak of this because I am coming to the project to which all this is addressed, the Cumberland River, and you will get the force of it in a minute. I read now from page 4 of my minority views:

Then we find a new project in the bill for \$4,500,000 for the Cumberland River above Nashville, with an initial appropriation in the bill of \$200,000, requiring over 20 years to complete. This is in addition to \$3,282,500 already appropriated for the upper river in order to produce in 1915 about 37,000 tons of commerce, excluding sand hauled 9 miles and timber products. On this same river, the Cumberland below Nashville, the Government has further appropriated in past years \$3,184,267, in addition to \$632,000 more, contained in the pending bill to produce in 1915 just 16,374 tons of "commerce," excluding timber products and sand and gravel.

That is the report. The gentleman from North Carolina took the floor to say that that statement was not true in substance. What did he say? He took the rafted products, ignoring the statement giving the items as timber products, and I say as I said then that this item is exactly true from the Engineer's report. My report is correct in that particular. The Secretary is a fair and honorable young man and has followed me and checked me up in all these items. I am sure he has found no such error.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Is it not a question of the veracity of the gentleman or any other gentleman in the House but rather the fact that the report directly says that the benefit to be derived from such a project as the Cumberland River can not be secured until the completion of the various items? In other words, there are eight locks, I think it is, in the project now before us, and naturally is it not a fair statement that until these are all completed the real benefit from the project can not be secured? I think that is the point.

Mr. FREAR. Oh, that has no relation at all to this.

Mr. TREADWAY. It surely has relation to the merits of the project.

Mr. FREAR. It has no relation to the statement of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL], who criticizes my report and said these statements were not correct. They were absolutely correct, according to the Engineer's report, because I checked them up immediately afterwards. Now, the gentleman criticizes me for telling half truths. I can not afford that, and neither can any man who wants to be fair, and I try to be fair. I have not made a single statement in regard to commerce, a single statement in regard to a project, that I did not believe to be just and square. I take that as illustrating the gen-

tleman quoting me wrong, and this is not a question of rafting I was discussing. I was discussing here the very statement he was correcting me on—timber products. I will put it in the RECORD, if necessary, to confirm the statements made in this report.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] says that he is entitled to the sympathy and co-operation of this House because he is standing alone—

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman yield? I never made such a statement.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, if it were proper, I would like to have the stenographer read what the gentleman did say about standing alone here.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the stenographer will read.

Mr. SMALL. I understand he is not on the floor, but I would like to have him sent for to see who is right about this. The gentleman stated substantially that he was standing alone here defending, or whatever the words were he used, but, at any rate, that he was standing alone here exposing the faults, waste, extravagances, and stealings in this bill.

Mr. FREAR. I trust the gentleman will permit me to interrupt him for—

Mr. SMALL. I do not desire to yield.

Mr. FREAR. The gentleman misquotes me.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield. I do not misquote him. I will ask the Chair whether he has sent for the stenographer?

Mr. FREAR. The gentleman misquotes me right there.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order the gentleman is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman must not interrupt the Member who has the floor without his consent.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I want the Chair to send for the stenographer and have those words repeated which he did say here. The gentleman from Wisconsin virtually states that he is the only gentleman in this House who has the honesty, the integrity, the sense of public duty to stand here and expose the iniquities in a bill reported by a committee of which he himself is a member, and in the formation of which bill he admits he took very little, if any, part, but consumed his time in preparing a minority report. And this gentleman says by reason of his peculiar fitness and qualifications that he is the only one who has the patriotism and the courage to stand up here and fight this bill. He admits that he is the only one, and upon that theory and that basis he goes before the country and the press as the only man of sufficient virtue and honesty to stand up here and contest a bill reported by a committee of which he was a member, a bill which he did not help to formulate and report, a member of the committee who, as he said upon the floor of this House, would not vote for the bill under any conditions. He would have us to believe that he is the only honorable Member of this House fitted to discharge this duty of public critic and conservator of public morals. And that is the answer the gentleman makes, Mr. Chairman, about the suggestion that in regard to items here he picks out a segregated statement and upon that attempts to reach a conclusion himself and have the House reach a conclusion that a certain proposition is without merit, and at the same time fails to tell all of the truth. That is the statement I made, and that is the statement I can prove; that is the statement I put to the country.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, may I have two minutes of time?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I simply stated in regard to the report to show that the gentleman did not quote me correctly. He asked me what did I say. I certainly did not ask for sympathy. The gentleman says I am on this committee, and refused to take part in the proceedings and to support the bill now under consideration.

Mr. SMALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. I have not the time or I would do so.

Mr. SMALL. I want to have the gentleman's statement read.

Mr. FREAR. Surely.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks that the stenographer read certain extracts from the remarks

of the gentleman. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Chair will say that the matter is being written up.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that we get a type-written copy.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that when the transcript be made it be brought into the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that when the matter is written up by the stenographer it be read by the Clerk from the desk. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FREAR. The point I objected to was the quotation that the gentleman read into my remarks. I did not ask for sympathy. Of course, I said I stood alone. Why? Not because I had more ability nor because I had more integrity nor because I had more intelligence. But I have made some study of these matters, and am endeavoring to show the waste that has occurred in past years.

Some gentlemen on the committee did not want me to go on the committee, I have been advised. But I have made a study for the purpose of improving conditions, if I can, improving the character of the bill, and it was suggested by Members on the floor that I stand alone, but when the votes are counted I will not stand alone. We will not have as many votes as we had last time.

There are 80 new projects. They will diminish the vote materially; but I realize that I will not stand alone when this bill again comes up for passage.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Chair will state that the matter has been transcribed by the Reporter and is in possession of the Clerk, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Let us see what he said in all fairness and his desire to take advantage of one who is seeking here alone on the floor of this House to expose this bill. He, with others, continually jumps into the breach, so as to show his indignation.

Mr. SMALL. That is the part to which I referred.

Mr. FREAR. I agree that is a correct statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read from the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Cumberland River, Tenn. and Ky.: For maintenance above Nashville, \$5,000; for improvement above Nashville in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, printed in Rivers and Harbors Committee Document No. 10, Sixty-third Congress, second session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document, \$200,000; continuing improvement below Nashville, \$632,000; in all, \$837,000.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out, beginning in line 19 at the end of the line, the words "for improvement," and on page 26 through the figures "\$200,000." In other words, the new project.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 25, beginning on line 19, after the figures "\$5,000," strike out the words "for improvement" and all of the paragraph down to and including "\$200,000," on line 1, page 26.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, the reason I make the motion is this: We have already improved the Cumberland River below Nashville to the extent, up to June 30, 1916, of \$3,290,000. In the report of the engineer we find that the work is about 45 per cent completed. In other words, eventually the cost of the improvement below Nashville will be something over \$7,000,000.

Now, that is a distinct project, previously adopted, for which I have more or less sympathy as to its merits, and further, what criticism may be addressed to it, in my opinion, hardly can hold, because in a lock-and-dam project we all know that until the completion of the entire project it is not fair to draw comparisons of handling of freight and the usual commercial statistics.

But I want to differentiate between that project and the new project which we are asked to take on now above Nashville. We are committing the Government to another lock-and-dam proposition which the engineers now estimate will cost \$4,500,000.

Now, so far as I know, in my experience on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, a completed lock-and-dam project has not been brought forward. In other words, the whole system is an experiment. We have quite a number of them. The principal illustration, of course, is the enormous expenditure on the Ohio River, not yet completed. This one below Nashville is not yet completed. Let us go slow before we take on something which evidently, while it may have merit—I will not deny it has not, because I am not prepared to argue either

way in that connection—nevertheless is not an emergency, and we should not undertake this work at the present time and in the present condition of the Treasury.

Let us wait before we get into this new one, costing, as it will, as is estimated, \$4,500,000, or undoubtedly five or six millions before we get through. Let us see what the result is to be on the Ohio River, or what it is to be on the lower Cumberland, and these various other lock-and-dam projects. We do not need to have too many experiments going on at the same time. And that is what we are going to do when we take on this new project—experimenting still further as to the merits of the lock-and-dam proposition.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I concede the best of motives to my friend from Massachusetts, Mr. TREADWAY, in making a motion to strike out this clause of the bill. I am very much surprised, however, in view of the actual facts pertaining to this project, that the gentleman from Massachusetts feels constrained to make the motion. The truth is, instead of being a new project, this project is 30 years old. It was recommended favorably by the Department of Engineers in 1886.

Mr. TREADWAY. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. I am coming to the period when it was temporarily discontinued.

Mr. TREADWAY. Is it not true that it is a new project as to having been adopted in the river and harbor bill under the definition of what is known as a new project?

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Not under what we know as a new project, except very technically. This project was favorably reported by the Department of Engineers to Congress from 1886, the entire 20 years following, until 1906. I take it that there is not a project in this bill that has been more closely scrutinized by every engineer connected with the Cumberland River, from the district engineer and the division engineer and the Board of Engineers, to the Chief of Engineers, than this project. In 1906 the shippers who originally made the reports of commerce had grown old, and many of them had died, and new ones neglected to report the commerce. The result was that suddenly this project was directed to be temporarily discontinued. A complete investigation of the facts as to the commerce followed, with the result that the district engineer, the division engineer, the Chief of Engineers, and the Board of Engineers recommended that this old project be continued until completion.

Now, the facts are, Mr. Chairman, that practically the same reason exists in favor of continuing this improvement that would exist in favor of building a railroad contemplated to be built into an immense timber and coal region which could not be developed until the road was completed to that locality. It would be as futile to stop the construction of such railroad when it got within sight of the country which was to furnish to it the chief commerce, as to discontinue this project when the locks and dams constructed have simply reached the gateway of a great undeveloped coal and timber and oil and agricultural region, 200 miles in length and 85 to 125 miles in width, which has been literally bottled up for a hundred years, and which, if opened by slack-water navigation, according to the testimony of business men and engineers who have made a personal inspection of it, would enable the States on the lower Cumberland, the lower Ohio, the Mississippi, and the Gulf ports, to receive all the coal and the hardwood timber that they would need for a generation.

Now I submit, Mr. Chairman, that 30 years ago, when Congress and the Department of Engineers turned to this river, which is 500 miles of navigable stream, 200 of which passes through this undeveloped section without transportation facilities, the chief object they had in view was to open up this undeveloped section which was to be depended on to furnish the chief commerce for the lower river. This project rests, therefore, not only on the ground that it is one of the oldest in the bill and has received the approval of all the engineers in the service and of Congress more frequently than almost any other project in the bill, but it rests on the further ground that it is an uncompleted project, and we can not hope to develop the real commerce of that river until it is completed. Then it rests upon the further ground that this section is utterly bottled up, and that this is the only method of egress.

A very able Member of another body nearly three years ago, without understanding all the facts, made a very violent assault upon this project, and yet when he discovered the true facts, he rose in his place and frankly admitted that this project was in fact entitled to immediate improvement.

Now, my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] suggests that there is no urgency in this project.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. The gentleman from Massachusetts suggests that there is no urgency in regard to the resumption and continuance of this up-river improvement. The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that there is the greatest urgency. I remember that during last fall there was a coal famine throughout the lower Cumberland River section, along the railroads even, when the people were utterly unable to secure coal on account of freight congestion all over the country. If the river had been open to navigation the people throughout the lower Cumberland and Tennessee and Ohio and Mississippi Valleys would have had the most ample supply of coal at the lowest possible prices. Then to say that this great undeveloped section, that these unlimited undeveloped resources, now bottled up and impossible of development—to say that that is not an emergency would indicate to my mind that it would be impossible to find an emergency river and harbor project.

Those are the chief outstanding facts in connection with this matter. Some other gentlemen on the upper and lower river will doubtless desire to consume a few minutes, and with this statement I submit to the candid judgment of the committee that the small sum of \$200,000, merely to commence one lock, while the lower river is now approaching completion, so far as the appropriations are concerned, fits in precisely with the recommendations of the engineers who at times have questioned the immediate improvement of the upper river, but in the same connection stated that as the completion of the lower river was approached it would be proper to proceed with the completion of the upper river. This item should be \$350,000, as recommended by the engineers.

To show a faint insight into the boundless commercial possibilities of the upper Cumberland, I read a letter recently received from Mr. O. H. Anderson, president of Oneida & Western Railroad Co., as follows:

ONEIDA, TENN., January 15, 1917.

HON. CORDELL HULL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE HULL: I am familiar with the territory traversed by the Cumberland River from Burnside, Ky., to Nashville, Tenn., and have made a study of the natural resources of this territory, and can say that the territory between Lock 8 on the Cumberland River and Burnside is possibly the finest area of hardwood timber east of the Mississippi River. This territory is from 75 to 125 miles in width, without transportation facilities of any kind save for the tides in the river during the winter and spring of each year.

The coal fields situated on the south and east of the river in Scott, Pickett, and Fentress Counties are undeveloped and will remain so unless it is possible to get slack-water navigation on the river. I am now engaged in building a railroad west from Oneida, Tenn., through Fentress and Pickett Counties in the direction of the Cumberland River, and expect ultimately to complete this road to a point on the river in the heart of this territory.

We have opened up a seam of coal in Fentress County 4 feet 6 inches in thickness without a parting, and if the road was completed to the river and we had slack-water navigation all of the States bordering on Cumberland River, the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers and tributaries that are navigable, could be supplied from this source with coal, timber, and other resources, and could be supplied a great deal more cheaply than is possible from any other section of the country. We have tested out 6,000 acres of coal lands and find it underlain with this seam of coal, and we are certain that at least 40,000 acres along the line of this road contain this seam of coal. The reports made by the geologists of the State of Tennessee and the surveys made by the Government failed to disclose the fact that this vast territory is underlain with coal, and for this reason many prospective coal men have been deterred from making a sufficient investigation.

We certainly hope that you will be able to secure legislation during this session of Congress that will enable us to develop this vast region as it should be developed. As you are aware, a large portion of this territory produces oil in paying quantities, and it is only a question of time until the development will be made, with proper transportation facilities.

Yours, very truly,

O. H. ANDERSON,
President Oneida & Western Railroad Co.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, it is not often that I take part in a matter of this kind, where I am not on the committee, and have not, of course, as accurate knowledge as the members of the committee may have about the project. But I want to say about this particular appropriation that I do have some personal and, I believe, accurate knowledge. The Cumberland River is improved from Nashville northward for about 115 to 125 miles. There is a considerable trade on it, and there has been developed, by reason of these river improvements, a large area of territory. A railroad has gone up that far, which has developed the territory more. Now, from a point on the railroad called Cookeville north to the Kentucky line there is no means of transportation at all except this river. They have no railroad transporta-

tion at all now in that great country included in Clay, and Pickett, and Fentress, Jackson, Overton, and other counties up there in that vicinity along the banks of this river. They have no other transportation except the river. If the river is opened up there, it would develop a very large territory. It is a part of the present project. Although it is called, I believe, by the experts, a new project, really it is a part of the present project. It is just a development of the present project, and it is more necessary than improvements lower down on the river, if that is possible, for this reason, that lower down on the river they have railroad transportation. Higher, and especially through Clay County, they have no transportation, and they have to haul with wagons and trucks all through that country.

I want to say that I have been all over that country. I went over it in a Ford. I am familiar with it. I went right along the banks of the river for many miles. It is one of the richest portions of our country. It is a beautiful and picturesque country. Richer or more productive lands can not be found anywhere, and these people are as fine as there are in the world.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Do I understand the gentleman to say he went down the river in a Ford?

Mr. McKELLAR. I went both up and down the banks of the river in a Ford. I did not try the Ford on the river. It was not Salt River, either.

I want to say to the House, speaking seriously about it, that this is a very worthy project. They have productive farm lands and coal lands. It is a rich soil. They raise corn and wheat and potatoes and hogs and everything that can be raised in this country of ours, almost. All that they lack is transportation. Their best and easiest method of transportation is through this river that has been improved within just a few miles of where it will do them the most good, and it ought to be improved up to the Kentucky line. A large territory would be served and developed.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. I want to ask the gentleman, Are there any railroads that tap this section of Tennessee?

Mr. McKELLAR. There is a railroad that goes through from Nashville to Knoxville, known as the Tennessee Central, but it does not tap this section of the country. The only means of ingress and egress is by team, or, when the weather is good, by automobiles. But ordinarily, under usual conditions of weather, they have to haul all of their truck out of there by team, and they have to haul in with teams all that they buy. Now, there is no reason in the world for that condition of affairs. This is just a gap between projects that have already been undertaken. I believe, so far as I know, it is more necessary than any other project that is in this bill. In my judgment, if we were to omit anything from the bill, we could omit any other project better than we could this. The district engineer reported in favor of it. The division engineer reported against it. Then a lot of gentlemen went before this board and presented the matter, and the board reversed itself, so the project has been put in the bill, and it should remain in the bill. I am sure if the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] was familiar with the situation as we are down there, and as the Congressman from that district [Mr. HULL of Tennessee] is, who knows about the matter personally, and like all of those people who appeared before the board and who know the situation, the gentleman would not press his amendment to strike this out. It is one of the most deserving projects in the bill, and I hope the House will permit it to stay in. It is a small appropriation, comparatively speaking, but it is due the people of that part of our State to have some method of transportation better than they now have. This river is there. It can be improved, and in my judgment it ought to be improved, and I hope the motion of the gentleman to strike it out will not prevail, and I hope my distinguished friend from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] will not press his objections.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, the river and harbor bill now under consideration carries a provision of much interest and great importance to the whole State of Kentucky, and especially that portion of Kentucky which lies in the congressional district I have the honor to represent. I refer to that provision which indorses the expenditure of four and one-half million dollars for the complete canalization of the upper Cumberland River from Burnside, Ky., to Nashville, Tenn., and which makes immediately available for that purpose the sum of \$200,000. Mr. Chairman, I have long since learned to respect and value the opinion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], who has made a motion to strike out this item from the bill. But he is not conversant with the facts, as I shall proceed

to show. He does not understand the situation. Of course, his motion will not prevail.

I hope this sum of \$200,000 will be increased in the Senate, so that at least a part of the sum as increased may be used in purchasing four lock and dam sites in the State of Tennessee and six or eight in the State of Kentucky. When these sites are selected and locks and dams built thereon, it will complete the canalization of the entire upper Cumberland from Nashville to Burnside. There are now seven locks and dams in the Cumberland River, in the State of Tennessee, above Nashville, and a site already selected for the eighth lock and dam. On the Kentucky side we have but one lock and dam, namely, Lock and Dam 21, 30 miles below Burnside, Ky. The sites for all the new locks and dams on the Kentucky side will have to be selected and paid for.

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR LOCK 21.

In the political campaigns down in the eleventh congressional district of Kentucky there has been much contention as to whether credit is due to former Congressman D. C. Edwards or former Congressman Dr. W. Godfrey Hunter for Lock and Dam No. 21 below Burnside.

Away back in 1882 Congress made provision for a survey of the upper Cumberland River to determine the feasibility and cost of improving it from Nashville, Tenn., to Burnside, Ky. The report of this survey also included the improvement of the Cumberland River to Smith Shoals above Burnside, Ky. The entire project, as later revised, provided for the construction of 28 locks and dams, also a minimum depth of 6 feet in the river for the entire distance from Nashville, Tenn., to the proposed head of navigation, a distance of 357 miles. This was approved by Congress, and work on this project was commenced in 1888 and was continued at intervals up to February 26, 1906, when the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors recommended that the work on the locks and dams already begun should be completed and that the rest of the project should be discontinued.

Locks 1 and 2, on the Tennessee side, had at that time been completed, while Lock 21, on the Kentucky side, and Locks 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, on the Tennessee side, were under construction. Since February 26, 1906, Lock 21, on the Kentucky side, and Locks 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, on the Tennessee side, have been completed, but it must be remembered that on February 26, 1906, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors said that they would not recommend any more money for any further improvement on the upper Cumberland River, either on the Kentucky or the Tennessee side, except to complete the locks and dams already begun. That there can be no chance of inaccuracy, I quote the following from House Document No. 10, Sixty-third Congress, second session:

On February 26, 1906, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, after visiting the river and holding hearings to obtain full information, submitted a report (printed as H. Doc. No. 699, 59th Cong., 1st sess.), from which the following is quoted: "The board is of the opinion that the regulation of the river and * * * the completion of Locks and Dams Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, above Nashville, * * * is worthy of being continued by the United States, but that the construction of the locks and dams proposed between Carthage and Burnside, except No. 21, now under contract, is not at present justified by the commerce involved."

This shows that I am not mistaken in the statements I have made. This report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, made on February 26, 1906, put the upper Cumberland River on the "bum," so to speak, and not a single cent of money has been expended since that day, except on Lock 21, for the buying of a single site for any other lock and dam in the Cumberland River on the Kentucky side, nor the appropriation of a single cent for the construction of one.

Congressman D. C. Edwards entered Congress on March 4, 1905, and remained in Congress for six years, or until March 4, 1911, when I succeeded him. He had been in Congress a few days less than one year, when the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, on February 26, 1906, reversed the policy of constructing enough locks and dams in the Cumberland River (28 in number) to make the river navigable the year round from Nashville, Tenn., to Burnside, Ky.

Mr. Edwards was a Member of Congress for six years. His first term began on March 4, 1905, and his last term ended on March 4, 1911. Dr. W. Godfrey Hunter was the man in Congress just prior to the first term of Mr. Edwards. Dr. Hunter became a Member of Congress on March 4, 1903, and continued in Congress for two years, or until March 4, 1905, when Mr. Edwards succeeded him. It was Dr. Hunter who succeeded in inducing the Fifty-eighth Congress to begin the improvement of the upper Cumberland below Burnside by appropriating \$74,000 for this purpose. Dr. Hunter was a Member of the Fifty-eighth Congress, while Mr. Edwards was a Member of the Fifty-ninth, Sixtieth, and Sixty-first Congresses. So, in the Fifty-

eighth Congress \$74,000 was appropriated by Congress to locate and begin the construction of Lock 21, below Burnside, Ky. The rivers and harbors bill, carrying an appropriation of \$74,000, became a law on March 3, 1905, before Mr. Edwards became a Member of Congress. Then, to Dr. W. Godfrey Hunter is due the credit of securing the first \$74,000 to begin the construction of Lock and Dam 21. On June 3, 1906, March 4, 1907, and June 25, 1910, Congressman Edwards secured \$120,000, \$30,000, and \$85,000, respectively, to help complete Lock and Dam 21.

It has been the policy of the Government to begin at the mouth of the river and build locks and dams from the mouth up, and not from the head down. This accounts for the fact that, while the Government in 1882 decided upon the policy of improving and canalizing the entire upper Cumberland and adhered steadfastly to that policy for a quarter of a century, no Member of Congress from the eleventh congressional district of Kentucky was able to get any money appropriated to begin building locks and dams at the upper end of the river below Burnside, Ky.; and this, too, notwithstanding the fact that the eleventh congressional district during all this time was represented by a Republican Representative, and notwithstanding the further fact that during the last 16 years of this period, or down to March 4, 1911, the Republican Party was in power in the Nation, with Republican Presidents in the White House, supported by Republican Congresses.

During the Republican rule Democratic Members of Congress from the State of Tennessee had gotten from Republican Congresses appropriations sufficient to build and construct Locks and Dams 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 in the Cumberland River above Nashville, Tenn. These appropriations, all told, will amount, in round numbers, to \$3,000,000. Republican Members of Congress from the eleventh congressional district were just as able men as those from the State of Tennessee and just as faithful to their trusts; but they were unable to induce the Government to break its precedent and policy of improving its navigable rivers from the mouth up and not from the head down, and it remained for Dr. W. Godfrey Hunter to break this precedent.

WHAT HAD TO BE DONE TO SECURE APPROPRIATIONS.

It is an impossible task to get Congress to make an appropriation to build a lock and dam in any stream unless the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and the Chief of Engineers of the Army recommend such construction. On February 26, 1906, they said in a report that the commerce in the upper Cumberland was not sufficient to justify the Government in expending more money in constructing locks and dams in the upper Cumberland on the Kentucky side except to complete Lock and Dam 21, as I have heretofore pointed out. This report of February 26, 1906, was made during the first year of Congressman Edwards's first term in Congress, and during the remaining five years he was a Member of the House he was unable to get the Government to reverse itself. He was unable to get any money appropriated to start any new locks and dams in the upper Cumberland, although he worked hard and faithfully to that end. It was a difficult thing to do.

When I became a Member of Congress on March 4, 1911, I found the upper Cumberland still under the ban, the Government refusing to start any new locks and dams there. All those conversant with the situation and interested in the canalization of the upper Cumberland knew that we never would get Congress to appropriate any more money for the purpose unless we could get a favorable report from the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to that effect. Realizing our dilemma, those interested in the improvement of the upper Cumberland set to work to see if they could get the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to reverse itself and report favorably instead of adversely upon the further canalization of the upper Cumberland. The first logical step in this matter was the introduction of a resolution before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives, and accordingly the following resolution was introduced before and passed by that body:

Resolved by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives of the United States, That the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, created under section 3 of the river and harbor act, approved June 13, 1902, be requested to reconsider its previous reports on Cumberland River above Nashville, Tenn., and to make a further report with recommendation as to the desirability at the present time of constructing one or more locks and dams above Lock No. 7.

On December 5, 1912, the said board granted a hearing here in Washington to those interested in the canalization of the upper Cumberland, and Congressman CORDELL HULL, who represents the Tennessee district on the Cumberland River just south of the Kentucky boundary line, myself, and others appeared before that board and made arguments for the complete canalization of the upper Cumberland from Burnside, Ky., to

Nashville, Tenn. We urged that the commerce in the upper Cumberland and the isolation of our people from railroads and the lack of transportation facilities fully justified the Government in spending the money to improve and canalize this stream. We asked for a new survey of the upper Cumberland.

The board granted our request and instructed the local engineer, Maj. Burgess, who is stationed at Nashville, Tenn., to make a complete survey of the upper Cumberland from Burnside, Ky., to Nashville, Tenn., which he did, making his report on December 30, 1913. Maj. Burgess made a most thorough and exhaustive examination of the advisability of a complete canalization of the Cumberland River between those two points and reported favorably on that project. He estimated that it would cost the Government \$4,500,000 to complete the canalization of the upper Cumberland from Burnside, Ky., to Nashville, Tenn.; that four new sites for locks and dams would have to be secured on the Tennessee side and six or eight on the Kentucky side, and that to purchase these sites and construct the necessary locks and dams would cost about \$4,500,000, and that it ought to be done at the expense of the Government.

The division engineer differed from Maj. Burgess, the local engineer, in this: The division engineer recommended that the canalization of the upper Cumberland ought not to be undertaken by the Federal Government unless the State of Kentucky and the State of Tennessee would undertake to pay half of the expense of it, or, in other words, \$2,225,000. Those interested in the canalization of the upper Cumberland knew that the States of Kentucky and Tennessee would never do this, and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors on January 28, 1914, kindly granted us a hearing on this proposition. A pretty complete delegation of Senators and Members of Congress, both from the States of Tennessee and Kentucky, appeared before the board on that date and made arguments in favor of the complete canalization of the upper Cumberland at Government expense. I am one of those who made an argument upon that occasion. The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, after hearing the arguments made before it, recommended to the Chief of Engineers of the Army that the entire upper Cumberland be locked and dammed at Government expense.

On February 4, 1914, in making his report to Hon. STEPHEN M. SPARKMAN, chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, of which I was a member, the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army said:

After due consideration of all the facts available I concur with the views of the district officer and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. The first appropriation should be \$340,000, for securing all lock and dam sites and for beginning construction of Lock and Dam No. 8, with contract authorization for \$201,000, covering the completion of this lock and dam. Subsequent appropriations should be sufficient to permit the beginning of construction of two additional locks and dams each year.

We incorporated in the rivers and harbors bill of 1914 the item of \$340,000 to buy the remaining sites and properly begin the complete canalization of the upper Cumberland. We passed that bill through the House, but a filibuster killed it in the Senate. There has been included an item of \$200,000 in the bill we are now considering, "for improvement of the Cumberland River above Nashville in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, printed in Rivers and Harbors Committee Document No. 10, Sixty-third Congress, second session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document."

I have every confidence that this item in the bill will be passed by this House. Should it pass the Senate, be approved by the President, and become a law, the policy of the complete canalization of the upper Cumberland will be indorsed by the Government, and it will be only a question of time when the entire upper Cumberland will be locked and dammed. The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, as well as the Chief of Engineers of the Army, recommend that after this year the Government undertake to construct each year thereafter one additional lock and dam in the upper end of the river below Lock 21, and one in the lower end of the river above Lock 8, so in a few years this work will be completed, if this bill becomes a law, and the people in the counties along the Cumberland River from Burnside to Nashville will realize their dreams of over a quarter of a century.

We feel that we are justly entitled to this. On February 4, 1914, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors said in its report:

Data now available indicate that there is a commerce on the upper Cumberland amounting to about 300,000 tons, which is considerably more than heretofore reported.

When we consider the fact that boats are able to run on the greater portion of the upper Cumberland only four or five months out of the year, the wonder is that our commerce reaches 300,000 tons annually.

On the Kentucky side, below Burnside, the Cumberland River runs through or close to the counties of Pulaski, Wayne, Clinton, Cumberland, Russell, and Monroe. Taking the counties as a whole, their wealth consists largely in timber and coal. Coal constitutes no part and timber but a small part of the present commerce on the upper Cumberland.

The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in their report of February 4, 1914, to the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, made this statement:

A large part of this area is covered with timber of high value within hauling distance of the river, but under the existing uncertainties of navigation it can not be economically marketed. Much of the land in the valley and back in the hills is fertile but can not be cultivated to advantage for the same reason. There are also extensive coal lands that can be made tributary to the upper reaches of the river by short rail connections, and it is claimed that these lands will be developed and that coal will be shipped out in large quantities.

This tells the story. It explains why our commerce is no larger than it is. It emphasizes the need of the canalization of this river in order to reach a market with our products.

According to the census of 1910 there were 283,200 acres of standing timber in Clinton County and 51,367 acres of woodland.

Cumberland County had 185,760 acres of standing timber and 95,341 acres of woodland. Monroe County had 86,945 acres of standing timber. Russell County had 80,666 acres. Wayne County had 17,818 acres of forest lands. This timber is virtually all there yet. It constitutes a part of the greatest boundary east of the Mississippi River of hardwood timber in this country, such as poplar, oak, walnut, cedar, chestnut, hickory, ash, and other valuable hardwood timbers.

All of the counties with possibly one exception is rich in coal.

Hon. W. A. Dicken, of Albany, Ky., a safe banker and conservative man, wrote me some time ago about coal lands in Clinton County. He said:

We estimate the number of acres of coal lands in Clinton County to be 12,500; average thickness of veins, 4 feet. The coal in this county is of good quality.

And so, gentlemen, with the other counties.

THE WEALTH OF LOWER COUNTIES.

But objection has been raised that the population of these counties have not increased much within the last 20 years and that, judging from the assessed value of their property, they are very poor. It is true that their population has not increased very rapidly. From 1890 to 1910, the population of Clinton County, for example, increased only from 7,000 to 8,153, and this, too, for the simple reason that they have been cut off from the outside world. It is true that they are rich in a certain sense, but their riches have not been given in at much. Why should it be? What is their coal and timber worth to them except to pay taxes on? What is their agriculture products worth to them except to subsist upon? It is a lamentable situation. If you will give these people ample transportation facilities, they will tell you a different story. I was reared on Brush Creek, up in Knox County. I remember when there was not a foot of railroad in that county or any of the adjoining counties. All these counties were rich in coal, but it was worth nothing to the owners, because they could not get it to market.

Brush Creek Valley comprises an area of over 10,000 acres. The creek is about 15 miles long. Many, many years ago one man owned all this territory. As part of the folklore of that neighborhood it is handed down to us that the former owner of this now princely domain sold the entire territory for a bed-quilt and a rifle gun. I can remember when this land sold for less than \$5 per acre. It is one of the richest coal fields in Knox County. A railroad has been built to it. When leased at 10 cents a ton royalty, each acre of this land brings the owner about \$1,000 in royalties. Most of this territory has been bought up by coal mining companies. It is to-day worth millions, with coal mining operations scattered all over it. Bell County adjoins Knox. I was virtually grown when the first railroad ran into that county. In 1900 Bell County's population was 15,701; in 1910 it was 28,447. It virtually doubled in 10 years. Bell County now produces more coal than any other county in the State of Kentucky. Her output last year was over 3,000,000 tons, or one-eighth of the entire output in the whole State.

Kentucky now stands fifth in the coal-producing States of the Union. Eastern Kentucky has 10,270 square miles of bituminous coal territory. Western Kentucky 6,400 square miles. The entire State of Pennsylvania has only 14,200 square miles. We have more square miles of bituminous coal territory in Kentucky than in the State of Pennsylvania, yet Pennsylvania in 1912 produced 160,000,000 tons of bituminous coal; Kentucky produced only 16,000,000. Why is this? The answer is transportation facilities. What has caused the lands on Brush Creek

in Knox County in my time to increase from \$5 per acre to over \$100 per acre? The answer is transportation facilities.

What will cause both the population and the wealth of the counties of Wayne, Clinton, Cumberland, Russell, and Monroe to double themselves, as has been done in the county of Bell?

The answer comes back transportation facilities. These people are cut off from the outside world. There is a territory there in Kentucky and Tennessee as big as the State of Connecticut without a foot of railroad in it. They have neither railroad transportation nor water transportation. They would not be asking you through their Representative here for water transportation if they had transportation by rail. It has been the policy of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and of this House and of Congress, to appropriate money on streams that have railroads going up and down either bank, and this Congress is still doing it. I voted for those things when I was on the Rivers and Harbors Committee. I voted for one in the State of California. I voted for others. I did it because I felt that the projects were worthy, and that the expenditure of the money was amply justified. If this Congress expends the money of the country on streams that have railroads going up and down either bank, if that is justifiable—and the Congress has taken the position heretofore that it is—how much more justifiable is it to spend money on streams that have absolutely no transportation either by water or by rail?

Mr. Chairman, ours is a deserving people. Wayne County has produced her Shelby M. Cullom, late a United States Senator from the State of Illinois. Clinton county nursed at her breast Gov. McMillan, of Tennessee, as well as Gov. Bramlette, of Kentucky. Monroe County claims the unique distinction of having furnished in the person of one man, Preston H. Leslie, a governor for two States. The people of southeastern Kentucky, these among them, are the greatest and purest reservoir of old Anglo-Saxon in this country.

Gentlemen, the justice of the cause of the people of the upper Cumberland are demanding an appropriation at your hands. I am relying upon your sense of fairness and your love of justice to give it to them. [Applause.]

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], because it occurs to me, with all due respect to the distinguished gentlemen who are supporting this measure, that it is wasteful. That is the only question with most of these propositions, and I recognize that there is a difference of opinion between those who are supporting and those who are opposing the different projects. I realize also the interest that is shown in this project, and that has been shown by very distinguished gentlemen who appear in the report urging the adoption of the project. After the Army engineers had refused, again they withdrew from that position. Now, what was true 30 years ago in regard to conditions in this country, I submit, is different to-day, and I want to quote the opinion of a man who I think is an authority on this subject. As I said, it is purely a question of judgment.

Senator Burton said on the floor of the Senate—not in this particular case—

The waste which has been incurred in canalization of rivers by the expensive system of locks and dams has been even worse than the improvement of open-channel rivers, the navigation of which has dwindled to such small proportions.

I just read a few moments ago a statement of Col. Townsend who said that we ought to stop work on all of these rivers in the Mississippi Valley, with two exceptions, until we have made two practical going propositions. I am not quoting his exact words.

I understand, of course, that in a case like the Cumberland River there is a break in the channel caused by this lack of development, but in the Mississippi River, without a break from St. Paul clear down to New Orleans, we could not get the commerce there, because the moment that commerce develops a railroad is immediately constructed and carries away the tonnage. That is quite true of almost every river I can think of. That is our experience with some of these other rivers. Thirty years ago it was looked upon as a big improvement, like the Hennepin Canal and the Big Sandy, but to-day we find there is no commerce to go on those rivers.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does not the gentleman think that after the river projects have been completed and the country developed it is natural for railroads to go there; but do not the people get the benefit of it in the reduced rates on the railroad?

Mr. FREAR. That is the difficulty with the whole thing. They are trying to use the Government and the Government's money for the express purpose of securing a reduction of freight rates,

when, as a matter of fact, I understand to-day they are seeking to raise railroad rates in order to enable the railroads to make a reasonable profit. In practically every State the railroad commission has the power to regulate rates. It ought not to be necessary for the Government to go in and develop these projects in order to reduce railroad rates.

Mr. POWERS. The gentleman is not contending that the reduction of railroad rates enters into this item?

Mr. FREAR. Oh, no; I was just answering the gentleman from Tennessee. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am always glad to have this project come up because it compels some able Members of the House to come here while we are discussing the river and harbor bill, and they always enlighten the House.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. I want to say that I appeared before the gentleman's committee, but the gentleman from Wisconsin was not present.

Mr. FREAR. I sincerely regret it. I am always delighted to hear the gentleman from Tennessee. I have heard him make several good speeches in the House, but not on the river and harbor bill, and I enjoyed them very much. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is one of the reasons I oppose these projects, because my experience is that results are not what we hoped they would be. We spend enormous sums of money without realizing reasonable results. That is the waste of which the country has right to complain.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the existing project for the improvement of the Cumberland River was adopted more than 30 years ago, so far as the upper part of the river is concerned. The project on the lower river was adopted in 1892, and there have been no modifications of these projects except by elimination of one or two of the locks and dams which were originally proposed.

Under that project the Cumberland River was divided into two parts—what is known as the upper and lower river, the dividing line being at Nashville, Tenn. There have been constructed eight locks and dams in the upper part of the river, beginning at Nashville, Lock 21 being at Burnside, more than 300 miles above Nashville.

In the lower river one lock and dam was completed several years ago, and recently two additional locks and dams have been completed and another is nearing completion. The appropriation made last year was sufficient to enable the Government to begin the construction of Locks E and F, and that appropriation, with the appropriation in this bill, will almost entirely complete the canalization of the lower river. Notwithstanding this fact, notwithstanding the fact that as a result of the action of Congress we have a great slack-water canal there situated almost midway of the navigable portion of the river, but which does not reach the great territory in the upper part of the river so rich in coal and timber products, the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Wisconsin would have Congress abandon the work and not carry out the project as originally planned by the engineers and by various Congresses extending over a period of 30 years, and thus not give to that section and the country the advantages which were originally contemplated.

Mention has been made of the rich territory contiguous to the upper Cumberland River. I dare say there is no section of the country which is more fertile and more capable of high development than the Cumberland River Valley, through which this great river flows. The land will produce any crop grown in the Temperate Zone. No section of country offers better advantages for stock raising and other farm activities. Mention has been made of the great coal fields that exist on the upper part of the river and the abundance of forest products which would be available if there were any means of transportation.

As has been stated, railroads do not penetrate and can not penetrate this section, and the only method by which this coal and timber can be secured for the benefit of the people of the country is by way of this river.

I dare say there is no section of the country, Mr. Chairman—certainly very few—which are richer in coal than the upper Cumberland River, and if this appropriation of \$200,000 is made to begin the construction of Lock 8 it will begin the work of making this river available as an outlet for all the coal and timber products and the rich agricultural products in that valley.

In the letter read by my colleague [Mr. HULL] the statement is made that the coal fields situated on the southeast of the river in Scott, Pickett, and Fentress Counties are undeveloped, and will remain so unless it is possible to get slack-water navigation on the river.

The gentleman writing this letter states that he is now engaged in building a railroad west from Oneida, Tenn., through

Fentress and Pickett Counties in the direction of the Cumberland River, and that he expects ultimately to complete this road to a point in the river in the heart of this territory. He further states:

We have opened up a seam of coal in Fentress County 4 feet and 6 inches in thickness without a parting, and if the road was completed to the river and we had slack-water navigation all of the States bordering on the Cumberland River, the Ohio, and Mississippi Rivers and tributaries that are navigable, could be supplied from this source with coal, timber, and other resources and could be supplied a great deal more cheaply than is possible from any other section of the country. We have tested out 6,000 acres of coal lands and find it underlaid with this seam of coal and we are certain that at least 40,000 along the line of this road contains this seam of coal.

He is building the road from these rich coal fields toward the river, but there must be a river navigable all the year round if this coal is to find its way to the markets of the country.

As showing the interest taken in the improvement of this river and its importance from a commercial standpoint, I wish to read a part of an editorial which appeared the other day in the Nashville Banner, one of the leading and most influential papers in the entire South. This editorial says:

Busy scenes are being enacted at the Broad Street wharf during these days of flood tide in the Cumberland River, reminding of the time when the Cumberland took a much more conspicuous part in the trade with the sections which it connects with Nashville. The high water has lifted the prows of the steamboats to a point only a few feet below the level of the street, and the wharves are packed with cargoes for shipment. It is announced that the *Alabama*, a large steamer, has been brought to this city for service on the lower Cumberland. All boats plying on the Cumberland with Nashville as headquarters report a boom in business.

The decadence of the river transportation business has been lamented most earnestly by the business men of this city. More than once Nashville has been threatened with the loss of a favorable freight rate because of the limited traffic brought here by water. Such busy scenes as now prevail at the wharf would convince any unprejudiced visitor of the importance of the river trade and of the competition which it furnishes for railroad transportation.

It is a matter of congratulation that the Cumberland River has been provided for in the appropriation bill. The extension of the locks and dams will in time provide transportation all the year around along several hundred miles of the Cumberland above and below Nashville. While the big river steamers will not be able at all seasons to push their noses almost into Broad Street as at present, they will be able to carry a steady traffic up and down the Cumberland, thence up and down the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, reaching the largest commercial centers, and to the enrichment of communities without other means of freight connection with the outside world, and thus bring added prosperity to Nashville's commercial life.

So I say, gentlemen, that, looking at the whole situation and knowing as I do the richness of this great section which is penetrated by the Cumberland River, there is, I am sure, not an appropriation in this bill which is more meritorious than that recommended looking to completing the improvements on the upper and lower Cumberland River. This is not a new project, because this project was started more than 30 years ago. Congress has already constructed locks which have resulted in stock water navigation extending 125 miles above Nashville.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will pardon me, I call his attention to the fact that that railroad company has already expended \$800,000 in constructing 20 miles of road toward the Cumberland River through this section, and would spend probably \$1,000,000 more to get it to the river. They are depending upon slack-water navigation to develop that.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the statement. His statement is convincing as to the necessity for making these improvements.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], it seems to me, in some of his attacks upon various proposals in this bill has proceeded upon a wrong theory. He has proceeded upon the idea that no improvement should be undertaken unless the commerce already in existence fully justifies it. He has ignored the effect which such improvements will have in developing commerce by affording a cheap and certain outlet to the markets of the world in cases like this, where railroad facilities are inadequate or totally lacking. I submit these improvements are expected to develop commerce, and certainly no gentleman who is familiar with the territory through which the Cumberland River flows can doubt for one moment that when this river is fully improved it will greatly increase commerce. It is unreasonable to expect that boats will be put into commission upon a river where there is not all-the-year-round navigation. There is another reason for the improvement of this particular river, a reason which obtains as to all these various improvements.

and I want to take a moment of your time to refer to the report of the engineer upon the question of freight rates.

I have stated to you that in so far as this river is concerned we have at present a great slack-water channel of about 150 or 160 miles, affording all-the-year navigation. But both above and below it there are several months in the year when boats of reasonable size can not be operated. The engineer states in regard to the upper Cumberland that the completion of Lock 21, which is more than 300 miles above Nashville, has caused a reduction in freight rates of about one-half within its pool area:

Locks Nos. 1 to 7 have caused a reduction in railroad freight rates between Nashville and Carthage, 115.8 miles, and in river freight rates between Nashville and West Point, 125.2 miles.

The same is true with reference to the improvement on the lower Cumberland River. The engineer states:

The work on Locks B, C, and D will not facilitate navigation until the locks and dams are completed and placed in operation; nor can it be expected that the lower Cumberland River will be continuously navigable until the two remaining locks and dams have been completed. Nevertheless, even in its present condition, the lower Cumberland River has a marked effect on railroad freight rates, and the navigable facilities offered by this stream are undoubtedly responsible for the favorable freight rates which Nashville has been granted, as compared with rates between towns not connected by a navigable waterway. The effect of the continuous navigation provided by the canalization for the 41.4 miles below Nashville was noted from the immediate reduction by about 50 per cent in the rates charged by the Tennessee Central Railroad over that part of its line which parallels the pool of Dam A.

So I submit, Mr. Chairman, that from every standpoint this appropriation should be made. My only regret is that the Rivers and Harbors Committee could not see its way clear to make a still greater appropriation to more speedily carry on this work on the upper river, so that that section and the people there could sooner begin to enjoy all of its advantages. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ohio River: Continuing improvement by the construction of locks and dams with a view to securing a navigable depth of 9 feet, \$5,000,000.

Mr. LIEB. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, I have given thoughtful consideration of every item the pending bill contains, and I am sure of my own knowledge that no apologies are necessary. It is proposed to enact into a law one of the most meritorious pieces of legislation ever framed for the improvement of rivers and harbors. I think it is unfortunate that many items which should have gone into the bill have been left out because of the desire to economize. It therefore stands to reason that, having eliminated some very worthy projects, the remaining proposals are still more necessary in the program of development and must consequently represent the very cream of waterway needs in the country to-day.

We have reached the item proposing to make appropriations necessary to continue the canalization project of the Ohio River, but before going into the merits of the improvement of this stream which forms the southern boundary of the district I have the honor to represent, I wish to refer to my colleague, the eminent chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

I venture to say there is not a man on the floor of the House who does not view with reluctance the fact that Mr. SPARKMAN retires from Congress on the coming 4th of March. [Applause.] But the loss is not all ours, as the State of Florida loses a stalwart champion of its glories, its resources, and its preponderance as a unit in the system of a great Government.

Furthermore, the Nation loses from the halls of its Congress a representative and a leader whose invigorating personality, knowledge of the duties he has so worthily assumed, and whose value as a coworker is seldom eclipsed. [Applause.] He has been a Member of the House and of the River and Harbor Committee for 22 years, six years of which he has served as chairman of this important committee. I have been on the committee with him for four years, and therefore consider myself competent to judge of his capabilities. But if I had served with him over a span of a score or more of years, I do not believe I would know him any better than I do.

When Members of the House work together on a committee for any length of time they naturally entertain before long a feeling of partnership, much the same as men who engage in a business partnership. That is the way I feel toward Mr. SPARKMAN. But it has been a relation of partnership looking toward the best interests of the national constituency. It has been brought about through close association, and therefore I feel it is but fitting to mention my high regard for our chairman.

Few men I have ever known have displayed the industry that has characterized Mr. SPARKMAN's activities in behalf of

river and harbor improvements. He has in this and other ways shown himself eminently fitted for the sphere of congressional deliberation that he has been brought into as a result of his qualifications. I have taken several trips of investigation in an official capacity with the chairman, and mention this because it was here that I was treated to my greatest surprise as to the working qualities of the eminent Representative from Florida.

Trips of inspection taken by a committee do not always call for the arduous labor that characterizes the pursuit of duties in Washington, but I want to say that if anyone goes anywhere else with Mr. SPARKMAN he will soon learn that he sets a hard pace in his diligent and conscientious labors. Early in the morning and late at night finds him studiously engaged in the work at hand. His powers of observation are keen to the utmost, and he evidences an unusual willingness to grasp every piece of information brought to his attention as a sure guide for his future reference.

No doubt this capacity for diligent work is what makes him so well informed on river and harbor subjects. Whether the subject be important or unimportant, our chairman is invariably ready for a reply when information is asked of him. This retentive quality of his can best be appreciated by those who know how valuable it is to have at the tip of one's tongue an immense array of data and figures from among hundreds of river and harbor projects. Mr. SPARKMAN's knowledge is not confined to this country, as he traveled to various parts of the world as a member of the National Waterways Commission.

I am prompted to quote a few lines from the pen of James Whitcomb Riley:

And so it is you cheer me,
My old friend,
For to know you and be near you,
My old friend,
Makes my hope of clearer light,
And my faith of surer sight,
And my soul a purer white,
My old friend.

[Applause.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of taking advantage of this opportunity to say a few words about the improvement of the Ohio River in the neighborhood of its mouth. The committee has just passed an item on the Cumberland River in which \$632,000 are appropriated for the purpose of continuing the canalization of the Cumberland River below Nashville, comprising about 192 miles from Nashville to the mouth of the river at Smithland, Ky. In the original project of improving the Cumberland River locks ranging from A to G were provided for, but as the Rivers and Harbors Committee and Congress had given its approval to a project for the canalization of the Ohio River they took into consideration the building of Lock and Dam No. 52 below the mouth of the Cumberland River and above Paducah on the Ohio. Lock and Dam G has been eliminated from the Cumberland River because after Lock and Dam 52 is completed the water will be backed up into the Cumberland sufficiently far to eliminate the last lock that was to have been completed on that river. I am not certain whether the appropriation in this bill will be sufficient to complete the Cumberland or not. It will go a very long way toward completing the improvement of that great stream, but in order that the object of Congress and of the committee and of the Army engineers may be carried out, for the Cumberland River to receive the benefit of its combined improvements together with that of the Ohio River, it is necessary that the construction of Lock and Dam No. 52 below the mouth of the Cumberland River be commenced at the very earliest possible date. I have been before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and before the Board of Army Engineers, and I have camped upon the trail of the Chief of Engineers from time to time, urging the beginning of Lock and Dam No. 52 on the Ohio River at the very earliest possible moment, not only on account of the necessity of this improvement for the benefit of the navigation of the Ohio, but in order that the improvement upon the Cumberland River might not be retarded by delay in constructing Lock and Dam 52 below the mouth of that river on the Ohio River. For some reason, I presume reasons that appeal to the Army engineers from a technical standpoint, they have uniformly begun to construct locks and dams at the source of a river and have gone down to the mouth of the stream. I do not profess to be an engineer, I do not profess to criticize the technical skill of these men who have devised that method of improvement, but it does seem to me if there is any way for the Committee on Rivers and Harbors to remedy that by bringing in a bill specifically to instruct the Board of Engineers and Army officers where and when to begin this construction, it ought to be done. It seems to me that great injustice is worked

at the mouth of these rivers where the greatest amount of commerce exists by failing to construct the locks and dams on those great streams until smaller parts of the river have been completed where there is comparatively small navigation and commerce as compared with that on the great body of the river near its mouth.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Is it not necessary before there can be any amount of commerce on these rivers to have the whole system completed, and does it make any difference whether you have a big project or a little project, is it not true you have to have it all in operation before you are going to get sufficient commerce to warrant the investment of capital in boats, terminals, and so forth?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true, that the river is not completed as a whole for commercial purposes until it is canalized from beginning to end; and instead of beginning at that end where there is little commerce it seems to me that the engineers might shift their arrangement in such a way as to improve the river at a point where commerce exists in larger quantities than at the mere sources of those rivers.

Mr. SWITZER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will.

Mr. SWITZER. The gentleman has read the report of the Secretary of War on the lower Ohio?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have; but that report has not been adopted, and I want to say to the gentleman from Ohio I hope it will not be adopted, because if it is adopted—the gentleman refers to the dredging of the lower Ohio River?

Mr. SWITZER. What objection would the gentleman have to trying a cheaper method of obtaining the desired depth of the river? What is the objection to trying out such a proposition where it is inexpensive?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the gentleman, with reference to Locks and Dams 53 and 54, it may be possible for the recommendations of the engineers to be put into operation, though I do not think so; but in view of the fact that Lock and Dam 52 not only is to be constructed for the benefit of the Ohio River but in order also to back water up into the Cumberland River about 30 or 40 miles, I think it would be extremely inadvisable to eliminate Lock and Dam 52 on the Ohio River, and I desire to say—

Mr. SWITZER. That is an engineering problem, is it not, after all?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course it is an engineering problem. As I stated in the beginning, I do not profess to be a civil engineer or an Army engineer, but it is a well-known fact that commerce has been hindered and delayed and perhaps driven off the lower Ohio River because of the delay, and why not put these locks and dams at points where it will be worth while to construct them when all this system has been completed instead of completing them on small portions of the river where commerce is not so important?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The elimination of Lock and Dam 52 on the Ohio would make necessary the construction of Lock and Dam G on the Cumberland?

Mr. BARKLEY. It would. I was going to suggest that if the recommendation of the engineers should be complied with and Lock and Dam 52 on the Ohio River should be eliminated, it would still be necessary to readopt the project contemplating the building of Lock G on the Cumberland River, but inasmuch as the building of this one lock on the Ohio will improve that river and the Cumberland, too, it seems to me it ought not to be eliminated but that it ought to be begun and constructed as soon as possible.

And down toward the mouth of the river, where ordinarily the bed of the river is in some places a mile and a half wide, it is going to be a tremendous proposition to build and complete a lock and dam of the dimensions of Lock and Dam No. 52. In view of what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SMITH] says, it seems to me that they ought to give early attention to the locks on the lower river, so that it will not delay the completion of the entire project any more than is necessary.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto end in eight minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Reserving the right to object, is the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] going to discuss the Ohio River?

Mr. FREAR. Entirely confined to that.

Mr. BARKLEY. It may be necessary for somebody to say something in reply.

Mr. FREAR. I think so; but it will not be struck out of the bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let it go in then, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I realize that this is one of the items that Col. Townsend says ought to be improved, if any, in this experimental test that he proposes. It is a very expensive experiment, however, and I do not believe that we have followed it very closely so as to know that \$59,377,000 has already been appropriated for the stream, and \$33,265,000 more will be required on this last project, or \$92,642,783 altogether; that is, for the 9-foot project. It is an experiment.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The gentleman says \$90,000,000 is designed for the project.

Mr. FREAR. That will be the total appropriation of money outside of the maintenance we ask when this canalization system is completed. This last project carries \$50,000,000 or \$60,000,000.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. This amount of money has been expended by the United States Government on the Ohio River since the Government began to do the work?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The canalization was some \$62,000,000 or \$63,000,000.

Mr. FREAR. Yes. We have or will spend \$92,000,000 in preparing this stream for commerce and getting it in as good shape as we can. Of course, the argument that was offered just a few moments ago that the stream will never pay at its best until all the system is completed, may be said to be true of the Mississippi and other rivers.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. FREAR. I prefer not to yield now.

And for that reason I want to call attention to the traffic. It is given by the Army engineers at 4,814,000 tons in 1915. That is quite a large commerce in a way, although even in their reports they have in past times placed it as high as 13,000,000 tons, as I now remember. But it is now put down at something over 4,000,000 tons on the average, as they estimate, carried 25.6 miles on the average. There is that long river of 1,000 miles, with an average tonnage of 4,814,000, that is carried the average distance of 25.6 miles.

That tonnage, and I say this in order that my good friend from Ohio may have an opportunity of dwelling on this, is coal, 2,353,663 tons; gravel, 1,181,000 tons; sand, 1,824,000 tons; and waste, 28,000 tons. Leaving out the coal and other items named, and I suppose coal has value, leaves 63,683 tons, all hauled an average distance of 25.6 miles. I do not understand how we can stop the project. We are working on it. But that is the prospect we have of returns. So far 19 locks have not been touched. We had more coal and commerce of all kinds on the Ohio River before any locks were ever started, and because of the railroad competition on both sides of the river, which occurs on the Mississippi and occurs on all these large rivers, I predict that if any of us live long enough to see this project completed the commerce will be no larger than it is to-day. I hope I will be disappointed in that prediction, but that is my judgment, based upon the experience we have had with all these other projects.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I understood the gentleman to say that \$92,000,000 has been spent on this project.

Mr. FREAR. Has been appropriated or will be appropriated—on the Ohio River before the project is completed.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And the present project contemplates the expenditure of \$63,000,000?

Mr. FREAR. Sixty-three million dollars. We will spend \$92,000,000 on the river, and this is all the commerce that has been developed after nearly \$60,000,000 expenditure to date.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Sixty-three million dollars has not been spent up to date?

Mr. FREAR. Thirty million dollars more will be spent on this river.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman says we have 19 locks on the Ohio—

Mr. FREAR. To build yet.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And about one-half of the project cost has been expended?

Mr. FREAR. Just about.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. So that \$92,000,000 has not been spent?

Mr. FREAR. No. I said that would be the total amount. Only about \$55,000,000 to \$60,000,000 thus far.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is adding the previous expenditures to the \$63,000,000 project?

Mr. FREAR. Yes; to show the amount that has gone into the river to develop the present commerce.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Only half of which has been expended?

Mr. FREAR. Yes; that is right as to the last project.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, I wanted a few moments.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, I do not at all believe that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] takes his motion very seriously.

Mr. FREAR. It was a pro forma amendment.

Mr. SWITZER. This being a stream 968 miles long, and having utilized former expenditures to the extent of \$55,000,000, and requiring only \$33,000,000 more to complete the project, no one would think of abandoning it in the state it is now in—that is, there is work in progress on 17 locks and dams, and, of course, if the appropriation ceased, these uncompleted dams in the river, some of them half completed and others two-thirds constructed, would have to be removed, and then we would have to appropriate about as much money to remove those impediments as we have heretofore expended on the river, so that it would be ridiculous to strike out this item.

Mr. FREAR. I did not move to strike it out.

Mr. SWITZER. The gentleman is always referring to the small amount of tonnage on the Ohio River, and he sneers at the item of coal. The facts are, as shown by the reports of commerce for the year 1915, as I recollect them, that there is seven and one-half million tons of commerce, exclusive of ferriage. The gentleman says that at one time there were 13,000,000 of tonnage.

Mr. FREAR. That is the report of the engineers.

Mr. SWITZER. I will say this, that these reports made at that time to the Army engineers that the gentleman referred to have later been gone over, and the Army engineers now say that frequently the commerce was counted two or three times at some places at that time, and when the project was adopted in 1910 the special board and the Chief of Engineers discussed that matter of 13,000,000 tons, and they said that the commerce at that time, including the ferriage, excluding duplications, was about 9,300,000 tons. Including the ferriage in 1915, the commerce is 9,000,000 tons, and the last report of the Engineers shows that the commerce has not changed much in the last three or four years. It is now practically what it was when the report on this project was adopted in 1910. Still the gentleman from Wisconsin persists in saying that the commerce is disappearing from the Ohio River.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SWITZER. Yes.

Mr. MEEKER. I want to ask the gentleman if he believes that with the present trackage it would be possible for the railroads paralleling the Ohio to carry those 4,000,000 tons of coal additional?

Mr. FREAR. It is only two and one-half million tons.

Mr. SWITZER. The tonnage is 7,500,000 tons, including about 4,500,000 tons of coal. The gentleman from Missouri is nearer right than the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MEEKER. I thank the gentleman. One other question. The addition of three and one-half million tons of coal to the trackage of the Ohio railroads would make it impossible for them to haul it?

Mr. SWITZER. There is no doubt about that. There is no question but that this great waterway has been a great factor in holding down the rates on railroads paralleling the Ohio River. In the last 50 years more has been saved to the shippers of the country in reduced freight rates on account of this navigable stream than has been appropriated to keep the stream in running order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. SWITZER. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not true that if this river were canalized, so that the traffic would be open to the shippers all the year around, not only coal but other freights would be largely increased?

Mr. SWITZER. There is no question about that. But when the canalization is completed—and that is some years in the future—I do not know what the future tonnage of the river will be, but we do know that the tonnage of the Monongahela River, at the source of the stream, has doubled since its canalization. We do know that the activities along the upper Ohio are as great as those along the Monongahela, and we know that the coal is being carried on the Monongahela at 4 or 5 cents a ton, whereas it formerly cost 40 cents a ton to carry it; and I have no doubt but that the commerce of the stream is going to increase year by year. The valuation last year was \$50,000,000,

excluding ferriage. The valuation in the year 1915 was \$150,000,000, including ferriage, besides the 2,000,000 passengers on the main channel, and something like two and one-half or three millions of passengers on the ferries.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. SWITZER. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is this stream open to navigation in the winter months?

Mr. SWITZER. It depends on the winter. It has been open most of this winter. But in my time I have seen the Ohio River closed during the holidays, and closed sometimes for two or three months in the year on account of ice. I take it that only for a few weeks this winter has the ice appeared. It depends on the severity of the winter and volume of water in the river. If the water is high when the cold weather comes on, it does not freeze over so readily.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ontonagon Harbor, Mich.: For maintenance, \$9,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, just to add a word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the reports as they are at present put in, which leave out the question of ferriage. As the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Switzer] well said a moment ago, the ferriage was \$150,000,000. That has been figured in these estimates heretofore, and has apparently given a very large commerce to these rivers. It figured in the Mississippi River reports, as I will show when I get to that. But they are now taking out the ferriage. Of course, it is an absurdity to add that to the commerce of the river, because we do not need a deep channel, or a 9-foot channel, to get ferriage. That has been the difficulty with the Ohio River heretofore. Even without the canalization project we would not have to send this coal down on the railroads, because for 50 years we sent it down the Ohio to New Orleans in time of good water. I speak of this because it will show the character of the reports we are getting, because they are more accurate. I think the gentleman from Ohio is right. I do not think the loss of commerce would appear as great now as in the past. They calculated it according to a poor system. It is difficult, of course, to arrive at the actual commerce on a river, but they have added it up and find the whole commerce was carried only about 25 miles.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. ALLEN. This winter we came near having a very severe coal famine down the Ohio Valley, and until there was a rise in the river and enough water to float the barges that were waiting up the Kanawha and they were floated down there was no relief.

Mr. SWITZER. Will the gentleman allow me to interpose there?

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly.

Mr. SWITZER. The rise in the river to which the gentleman refers, which relieved that coal famine, was produced by opening some of those closed locks up the river, and adding to the current of the stream the water that had been conserved above. The coal came down on that rise caused by opening the locks.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pentwater and White Lake Harbors, Mich.: For maintenance of White Lake Harbor, \$5,500.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. McLAUGHLIN: Page 28, at the end of line 5, add the following: "and for maintenance of Pentwater Harbor, \$5,000."

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I believe the facts respecting Pentwater are different from those respecting any other project in the bill. You will notice that in line 4 the bill speaks of "Pentwater and White Lake Harbors." They are two harbors within 20 miles of each other; in fact, have always been carried as one project on the books of the Corps of Engineers. In 1909 the local engineer made a report which was approved by the Chief of Engineers and reported to Congress, recommending \$151,000 for the maintenance, repair, and improvement of these two harbors—this one project. The Chair and other members of the committee will remember that 1909 was the year when a very small river and harbor bill was passed, carrying appropriations only for worthy projects and those most needing support. Under those circumstances the Chief of Engineers recommended \$151,000 for this project—

these two harbors. Urged by the desire for economy, and on the demand of the then chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, Mr. Burton, of Ohio, the Chief of Engineers modified his report and recommended \$101,000 for these two harbors, and in a bill carrying only about \$9,000,000, and as everyone well understood, making provision only for worthy projects, there was carried an appropriation of \$101,000 for these two harbors.

A little later a survey was had of these harbors, and the engineer making the report differed from the engineer who had made the former report, and recommended that no more money be expended for these harbors. That unfavorable report stands to-day; but there was \$101,000 in the fund, and under direction of Congress the Corps of Engineers have been expending that money little by little, year after year, keeping those harbors open, keeping those places on the map.

That was the condition up to two years ago, when, failing to pass a regular river and harbor bill, Congress appropriated a lump sum of \$25,000,000 to be expended in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers. That authorization carried power and conferred discretion upon the Chief of Engineers to divert money from any fund or standing to the credit of any project and add it to the \$25,000,000. The Chief of Engineers, going over the list of projects in his office, found \$48,000 remaining in the fund for these little harbors, and arbitrarily diverted it and added it to the big sum of \$25,000,000, leaving these little harbors altogether without money for their further maintenance.

I am not asking this House to disregard the recommendation of the engineers that no more money be appropriated for these harbors. I am simply asking the House to restore to that fund and to the credit of one of these harbors, a small part of the money heretofore appropriated, and which, in my judgment, was improperly diverted and taken away by the Chief of Engineers. I doubt his authority under the act of two years ago, but he exercised that power, and he has totally depleted the fund for these harbors. He has made a recommendation this year of \$5,500 for one of the harbors, White Lake—and this bill carries a provision for that amount for White Lake—but no recommendation was made for Pentwater, and this bill carries nothing for it. I repeat, I am not asking this House to make an appropriation contrary to the recommendation of the engineers. I am simply asking the House to correct the mistake the engineers made in diverting the money that Congress had appropriated and set aside for this project, leaving this harbor without money.

I am asking for only a small part of the money that Congress has heretofore provided and intended should be used for these harbors so that they may be kept alive and given time for growth and development. I am not asking money for new work; simply asking for money enough to keep the harbor alive for a while, that it may have a little more time in which to justify a demand for permanent support. On the harbor of Pentwater there has been expended upward of \$300,000. It is a beautiful harbor. Formerly there was a large amount of business, largely lumber, but there has been a change in conditions in that part of Michigan. The lumber industry has gone, but agriculture and manufacture and fruit growing have come to take the place of lumber, and the county in which Pentwater is located, and of which it is the only port, is one of the very best fruit counties of the State of Michigan, but there is no outlet for its products. The engineers report a lack of commerce, but the harbor has not been maintained so there could be commerce. It is a fine summer-resort country, too; but the engineers in their investigation and report take no notice of passenger business. They report the dead freight, but pay no attention to live freight. I say it is a great fruit country, and splendid agricultural development, and there would be numerous and large shipments of fruit and farm products if there were harbor facilities. We all know that fruit is perishable, and that the growers of it will not take it to a harbor if they are in doubt as to the boat coming and going on schedule time. In that respect conditions have not been very favorable.

The owners of the boat lines have expressed their desire to make Pentwater one of their regular ports, and to make regular trips to that harbor, and I have many times heard residents of the village of Pentwater say that very often a boat plying Lake Michigan and scheduled to enter that harbor would come and stand off the harbor, but the captain, doubting his ability to enter during rough weather, would take his boat away. That difficulty could have been overcome if a little more money had been available for the improvement of the harbor. It can be kept in reasonable condition for a short time with this money. I am asking for only \$5,000, a small part of the \$48,000 appropriated by Congress, which was in-

tended for the maintenance of the harbor, but improperly diverted by the engineers, a serious mistake on their part. The adoption of my amendment will provide this little sum. It seems to me that conditions and facts as I describe them ought to appeal to the House and that there should be no opposition to the amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly to have to oppose the amendment offered by my friend from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN], but to adopt it would be to go directly in the face of the recommendation of the engineers, something that we have not heretofore done in this bill. The Board of Engineers in the report made by that body on June 15, 1915, used this language:

In view of the conditions existing at this harbor, the district officer in 1909 recommended its abandonment, and this recommendation has been included in recent annual reports of the Chief of Engineers. As a result of the present investigation the district officer now reaches a similar conclusion and recommends that the harbor be abandoned. In the opinion of the division engineer the harbor is not worthy of any improvement in amplification of the present project, but it is worthy of maintenance of the existing piers and of the present project channel for such width, less than the project width of 150 feet, as may be necessary for the harbor traffic.

3. This report has been referred, as required by law, to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and attention is invited to its report herewith, dated June 15, 1915, concurring in the views of the district officer.

4. After due consideration of the above-mentioned reports I concur in the views of the district officer and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and therefore report that the improvement by the United States of Pentwater Harbor, Mich., from the mouth of the channel to Pentwater Lake is deemed unworthy of further continuance or maintenance, and it is recommended that the project be abandoned and appropriations for this harbor discontinued.

It will be observed that we have not inserted a provision abandoning this project. We have treated that like we have a few others where similar recommendations have been made, and have used no language that would have the effect of abandoning the project. But we did not think, in the face of the recommendations, that we could go any further than appropriate the \$5,000 for White Lake.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Certainly.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. What does the gentleman think of the action of the engineers in diverting \$48,000 from this little project?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I would not think that action should be condemned in view of the conclusions to which they arrived that the project was not worthy of further improvement and maintenance. I am not defending the conclusion that the engineers have reached. I do not know anything about it, except what I see in the report. I would like to make this suggestion to the gentleman, that instead of trying to have the bill amended so as to insert an item of \$5,000 for Pentwater he have the matter referred back to the engineers; and if they have made any mistake let those interested go before the board and have it corrected. Let them proceed regularly, and not contrary to the report of the engineers.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. If the course suggested by the gentleman from Florida is followed, and we get no appropriation this year, there will be no commerce at that harbor, because the sand will drift in and no ship can enter. There will be no commerce upon which the engineers can report. This little appropriation that is asked for, only a small part of the large amount that they took away from the fund, ought to be made in order to keep the harbor open and in normal condition when next examined by the engineers.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am only asking the committee to go with the engineers in this matter. They have recommended its abandonment. I do not want to do that now. It may be that the gentleman or some one else can induce them to change their opinion. But here we are confronted with the recommendation that no more money be appropriated. If we appropriate the money in this bill, we would be contrary to the recommendation of the engineers.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, may I occupy a little more time?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in seven minutes, five minutes to be occupied by the gentleman from Michigan.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to add a few words concerning the history of this project. This \$101,000 that I speak of was appropriated in 1909. Following that there was an unfavorable report by the Corps of Engineers, and inasmuch as the expenditure of the \$101,000 was under the law discretionary

with them, they refused to spend any part of it. When the attention of Congress was called to the fact that an appropriation of \$101,000 had been made and yet the engineers refused to spend the money, this Congress, this House, with the approval of the Senate, inserted in the river and harbor bill of 1910 a positive direction to the engineers to expend the money theretofore appropriated. The engineers have been following that direction and have been spending the money, and if they had not improperly diverted it there was enough money for several years, so that the harbor might have time to grow and develop and later on justify a favorable report.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the distinguished chairman of the committee does not take the proper view of this matter. I am not asking the House to go contrary to the report and recommendation of the engineers. I believe that the policy pursued by the committee has been right. It should follow the engineers. I am simply asking that a portion of the money improperly diverted be returned to the fund.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I will.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In view of the recommendation that no more money be expended on the harbor either for improvement or maintenance, would we not violate the recommendation if we made this appropriation?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I do not look upon this as additional money; it is the return of a portion of the money improperly diverted.

When I learned the diversion had been made I called to see the Chief of Engineers and asked him why it had been done. He said, "We had authority to do it, and if you need more money you can go to Congress and get it." I told him of the difficulty I would have in the face of his unfavorable report, and he expressed the opinion that very likely Congress would take care of it. Now, I appeal to this committee to correct the mistakes of the engineer. I believe I am right and that I am asking only what is fair.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SPARKMAN) there were 32 ayes and 52 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Harbor of refuge at Harbor Beach, Mich.: For improvement in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 1700, Sixty-fourth Congress, second session, \$100,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do not know that I am against this paragraph, but it seems to me we ought to have some information about it. I do not know what the population of Harbor Beach, Mich., is or what the postal receipts are in that vicinity; but we ought to have some information, so long as we are about to appropriate the enormous sum of \$100,000 for improvements at Harbor Beach; we ought to know what the postal receipts are and what the population is.

Michigan is a very important waterway State, and it is represented here by some distinguished men who are not wholly in favor of appropriations for public buildings, provided the population and the postal receipts do not come to certain standards.

I am not sure, however, but that a great deal of money that might have gone into public buildings has already been expended at Harbor Beach, Mich. One hundred thousand dollars is asked for now. Such reports as I have seen indicate that we have expended upward of \$2,000,000 at this point in order to rear certain sheltering arms into the sea to protect a few vessels that might be in distress.

Mr. Chairman, if we were to apply the \$2,000,000 that we have expended at Harbor Beach, Mich., the population of which is not referred to in the engineer's report, and the postal receipts of which are not mentioned by any of the reports, according to the standards of certain gentlemen from Michigan, we could erect at \$10,000 each about 200 post offices throughout the country; or, if we applied this \$2,000,000 to the erection of post offices at \$10,000 each throughout the country, then, according to certain arguments we have heard, we could, if we distributed these post offices according to the districts, gather together a majority of the votes, and thus carry the bill. [Laughter.]

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. MEEKER. Has the gentleman noticed that this is a harbor of refuge?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes; a harbor of refuge.

Mr. MEEKER. Is the gentleman aware that Michigan has just gone dry? [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes. A harbor of refuge for \$100,000.

Mr. MEEKER. That explains it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It has been a harbor of refuge for \$2,000,000 altogether, up to date. If we took the \$2,000,000 that has gone into Harbor Beach, Mich., the population of which is not mentioned, and the postal receipts of which are not mentioned, and applied it to public buildings as I have indicated, we could erect 200 public buildings at \$10,000 each, and probably acquire 200 votes in this House in order to put that public-building bill through. But if we did that, Mr. Chairman, what would become of Harbor Beach, Mich.? What would this Michigan district say if its Representative went home without any pork for Harbor Beach?

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. KEARNS. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania mean to insinuate that the average Member of this House can be purchased with a post office costing \$10,000?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, so long as the gentleman puts a serious question to me, I would say that even now it is dangerous for a Member of this House to attend a banquet that costs a dollar and a quarter a plate [laughter], because if he does so, he might come under the keen, cold, gray eye of the gentleman from Jasper, Ind., who would rise in his place and with indignation furrowing his brow, say that such a man, attending a dollar-and-a-quarter banquet, might be susceptible to the charge of corrupt practice. [Laughter.] Mr. Chairman, I call attention to this item of \$100,000, grown in this way through a series of years to \$2,000,000, deposited by the Government at Harbor Beach, Mich., which might have been applied to public buildings, but which was not in order that gentlemen may realize that that large sum remains safe and snug behind the breakwater at Harbor Beach.

It may be that public buildings should not go into the district of any other gentleman while this worthy project is going on at Harbor Beach, but I am inclined to think that even though gentlemen representing such important projects as Harbor Beach, Mich., should get away with \$2,000,000 in the course of a few years, still they might prove up by giving us the population and the postal receipts. [Laughter.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Clinton River, Mich.: For maintenance, \$1,500.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, we have here the item of \$1,500 for maintenance of the Clinton River, Mich. Is there anyone here upon the committee or in the Committee of the Whole who can explain this item of the Clinton River, Mich.? I look about me, Mr. Chairman, and look over the observant countenances upon the floor. Gentlemen from Michigan are here, as are gentlemen from Wisconsin. I call upon anyone of these gentlemen to inform the House, if they will, about this item of \$1,500 for maintenance at Clinton River, Mich. Do I get a rise? [Laughter.] Does any gentleman defend this item? Is there a man, with soul so dead, from Michigan, who never to himself hath said, this is mine own, my little pet? [Laughter.] I see gentlemen from Michigan here—a great waterway State, with great waterway statesmen; will not some gentleman from Michigan rise? [Laughter.] Why, Mount Clemens is in Michigan, and somewhere near by that wonderful resort runs the Clinton River. Has no one ever gone up there to be cured of rheumatism? Cranberries are grown in this vicinity, and they compete with the cranberries of the New Jersey coast. Is there no one here to speak for this cranberry inlet? [Laughter.] Mr. Chairman, I still have a little time to give away to any gentleman who denounces the pork barrel, any gentleman who has it down in the depths of his representative corporosity to denounce appropriations made in the districts of other gentlemen, who will rise now and speak for the Clinton River. No one rises.

Mr. Chairman, I find in the engineer's report this simple statement:

Preliminary examination of Clinton River, Mich.: Report dated October 2, 1915, is printed in House Document No. 1014, Sixty-fourth Congress, second session.

Bear in mind, all of the formalities have been gone through with by somebody who represented the Clinton River, in Michigan. But the engineers say that—

Further improvement by the United States is not deemed advisable at the present time.

And yet we are spending—think of it, ye proponents of post offices and Federal buildings—\$1,500 for maintaining this river up there somewhere in Michigan, where you can go for a perfectly safe cure. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do; I am glad some gentleman has at last risen. Will the gentleman from Minnesota please tell me the population in the vicinity of the Clinton River?

Will the gentleman tell me the postal receipts along the Clinton River? Will the gentleman tell me why we should desecrate the Clinton River in a "pork barrel"? Will the gentleman tell me if we are warranted in risking this \$1,500 of the people's money—

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania (continuing). To improve the Clinton River when the whole State has gone dry? [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. What is the tonnage?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I can not find out, and I am appealing to some one to tell us the tonnage of the Clinton River.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRAMTON. Does the Chair rule that the gentleman is conducting a filibuster upon this important measure?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would like to argue that point of order, but the gentleman from Michigan having risen, I yield to him the balance of my time. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Indiana Harbor, Ind.: Completing improvement and for maintenance, \$415,200.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph which provides for an appropriation for Indiana Harbor of \$415,200.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 30, strike out all of lines 19 and 20.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, in making this motion to strike out this paragraph I do not intend, like my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], to entertain the membership of this committee, but I do so because I believe that it is improper for this committee to continue to appropriate large sums of money to any project that is subject to the control of private interests or corporations. Some few years ago in this locality the Government owned a river which the United States Steel Trust did not quite like, and therefore they closed it up and built a channel for their private use. Finding it was rather expensive to maintain that channel, they turned it over to the United States, so that the Government would have the privilege annually of appropriating from about \$50,000 to \$100,000 to maintain the channel for this poor, oppressed Steel Trust. Now, I have before me the report of the Board of Engineers, from which it appears that they expect some benefits for the people of that district to be realized in the near future. Unless I am very much mistaken, no one else outside of the Steel Trust and the Standard Oil Co. has up to this day used this channel, and I can not see why we should be called upon to maintain, enlarge, and protect, at such a tremendous cost, this privately owned channel.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Suppose that the business of the Steel Trust and the Standard Oil Co. at Indiana Harbor was divided up among 15 or 20 small concerns, would the gentleman then be in favor of improving this harbor?

Mr. SABATH. Oh, were it in the interests of the people, yes; but where it is for the direct interest of a gigantic trust I am opposed to it, especially when we know that millions and millions of dollars are being made by this trust that is seeking and claiming the aid of this body.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Do not those two companies do the same amount of business and employ the same number of men and pay the same amount of wages as if they were divided up among a number of men or a number of companies?

Mr. SABATH. Oh, they do more business than 15 companies, more than all the other companies in their particular line in the United States. I want to say to you that I very seldom see anybody coming to the rescue of the smaller men and urge the granting of benefits to them just as the gentleman is urging that we should come to the aid and assistance of this tremendous trust.

Mr. MADDEN. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. The United States steel plant is at Gary, Ind., is it not?

Mr. SABATH. No; but they are now using Indiana Harbor and they are also filling in a lake known as George Lake which belonged to the Government until it was discovered by the steel company. Now they believe it is their own, that it belongs to them, and so they have commenced filling it in.

Mr. MADDEN. How far is Gary from Indiana Harbor?

Mr. SABATH. It may be about—

Mr. MADDEN. Ten miles?

Mr. SABATH. Eight or ten miles I should say.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Is Indiana Harbor in the gentleman's district?

Mr. SABATH. No, it is not; and for the information of the gentleman from Washington I wish to say that neither he nor any other man has ever heard me ask for appropriations for my own district. What I desire to do is to oppose any unfair appropriation, whether it be for your district or for my district. I would not hesitate, if my district were in need of an improvement, to ask for it, but I would not ask for a large appropriation for the benefit of a trust or a corporation which has taken away property that formerly belonged to the Government and converted it to its own uses and benefits.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced the yeas seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. SABATH) there were—yeas 10, yeas 54.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOSTER). The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Clerk read as follows:

Illinois River, Ill.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance below Copperas Creek, \$30,000.

Mr. McKENZIE and Mr. BENNET rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] is recognized.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 31, after line 7, insert the following:
"Fulton Landing, Fulton, Ill.: For improvement of landing at Fulton, Ill., \$10,000."

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, I rise for a preferential motion relating to the paragraph.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, I rose at the same time that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] did to inquire about the paragraph in lines 4, 6, and 7. The Chair recognized the gentleman from Illinois to offer a new paragraph below.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands this is an amendment.

Mr. McKENZIE. It is a new paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET] is correct.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking in entire good faith of some one from Illinois, What is Copperas Creek?

Mr. MADDEN. Copperas Creek is a place down the river where we have had dams to regulate the flow of the water, and where it is thought necessary to erect these dams in order to lower the stage of water, so that it will not overflow the adjoining country.

Mr. BENNET. The word "creek" does not necessarily mean it is a small body of water?

Mr. MADDEN. It is the main Illinois River at Copperas Creek. It is the name of the town.

Mr. BENNET. I want to say that some of our New York papers, I am sorry to say, have been passing comments on this bill because it provides for the improvement of creeks.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, Copperas Creek is one of the locks and dams on the Illinois River, located at a point on the

river near where the creek by the name of "Copperas" flows into the river. Hence the name given the dam. It is not a dam called "Copperas Creek." It is a dam across the Illinois River, which cost over \$1,000,000 to build, through which lock in that dam commerce on that great river passes.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, the two gentlemen from Illinois have made such precisely similar explanations that one might have thought they rehearsed them if they had had a chance to do so. I thank the second gentleman from Illinois also.

The mere use of the word "creek" in a bill does not mean that the body of water is small. For instance, as to the State which I represent in part, there are appropriations in this bill for Newtown Creek, on which there is a tremendous commerce; Westchester Creek, on which there is about as much commerce as there is on the Mississippi River; and East Chester Creek; but I do not think it is fair even for the newspapers in my own State, without investigation, to criticize an item for a creek simply because of the use of the word "creek." If it is a real creek, that is so shallow that possibly it only amounts to a heavy dew, that is justifiable, but the mere word ought not to be a basis for criticism.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. FREAR. May I inquire what paper is making those extravagant statements?

Mr. BENNET. I do not own stock in any New York paper, and I decline to advertise any of them.

Mr. FREAR. I was wondering whether the fact that it was based upon commerce was the reason that it was humorously treated by the gentleman.

Mr. BENNET. Those I mentioned simply used the word "creek" as—

Mr. MEEKER. Because it says "Copperas Creek" does not mean that it is "copper."

Mr. SWITZER. Were they careful to exclude all the creeks in New York State from criticism?

Mr. BENNET. They do not criticize any creeks in New York State.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. I want to know if it is not true that newspapers do not care especially for the facts? What they care about is something that will attract attention. For example, a young friend of mine was being instructed as to how to gather news for the newspapers, and his instructor, one of our able editors, said, "Now, young man, if you run across an item where a dog bites a man, that is not news. Do not bring that in. But if you find a case where a man bites a dog, bring that in." Now, that is the proposition that is involved in these criticisms. The papers want us to present something that will excite the curiosity.

Mr. BENNET. That was always one of my favorite stories. [Laughter.]

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, what has become of the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offered a preferential motion, on which he wished to be heard.

Mr. McKENZIE. Then I will wait until that is disposed of.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, in further explanation of the Copperas Creek item, I desire to say Copperas Creek, on the Illinois River, is located about halfway between the mouth of the river and the head of navigation on the river, and it marks the point on the river where the Government work ends and where the work of the State of Illinois commences, because above Copperas Creek, on the Illinois River, the State of Illinois maintains the navigability of the river. Therefore if the New York papers are talking about Copperas Creek, they ought to discuss it in connection with the work the State of Illinois does. And, so far as I know, no other State contributes toward maintaining the navigability of a great river within its boundaries. We think so much of the Illinois River, above Copperas Creek and below Copperas Creek, and of the possibilities of connecting Lake Michigan with the Illinois River by a channel extending from Lake Michigan down to the Gulf of Mexico that the State of Illinois, when the question was submitted to the voters in that State, authorized the Legislature of Illinois to bond the State to borrow \$20,000,000 for the purpose of improving this great waterway.

Mr. BENNET. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. BENNET. Has the gentleman ever heard about what the State of New York did in bonding our State to improve the Mohawk, a navigable stream?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes; and the State of Illinois furnishes the commerce which makes it possible for the State of New York to appropriate \$100,000,000 for the purpose of improving the Erie Canal.

Mr. BENNET. Inasmuch as there are no tolls on the canal and we paid for the whole canal, part of the statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] is correct, but not the important part.

Mr. RAINEY. The State of New York is honored by having the commerce of the great State of Illinois pass through its territory.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague from New York accept an amendment to his statement?

Mr. BENNET. Yes.

Mr. HULBERT. The State of New York has appropriated \$157,000,000 instead of \$101,000,000.

Mr. RAINEY. I congratulate the State of New York on its policy in the matter of waterway improvements. The State of Illinois feels the same way about the waterways within its boundaries, and if it is possible for the State of Illinois to get a channel at least 14 feet deep opened down to the Gulf of Mexico the State of Illinois might be induced to appropriate a still larger amount than the people of that State have authorized its legislature to appropriate.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McKENZIE, to follow line 7, page 31: "Fulton Landing, Fulton, Ill.: For improvement of landing at Fulton, Ill., \$10,000."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I reserve a point of order on the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether this amendment is subject to a point of order. However, I want to make a very brief statement in connection with it.

Fulton is a town in Whiteside County, in the State of Illinois. It was at one time a great shipping point. Large sawmills were located there, and it was one of the good harbors or landings on the Mississippi River. In 1907 the Government expended \$4,015 in dredging out this landing, but since that time the channel has filled up, and it is impossible now for a boat to get up to the landing.

The people of Fulton sent me a petition, signed by all the leading people of the town of Fulton, asking me to take this matter up with the proper authorities. I sent the petition to the Mississippi River Commission, believing that they had jurisdiction over the matter. Col. Townsend, however, sent it to Maj. Hoffman, stationed at Rock Island, stating that it was a matter over which they had no jurisdiction, and that it required a specific appropriation. I received a letter from Maj. Hoffman in which he states that he can not divert any of the appropriation made for channel purposes to the improvement of a landing, and that it will be necessary to have a specific appropriation made for this purpose.

Now, he further says it will cost quite a large sum of money, perhaps \$20,000, to put this landing in first-class order, due to the fact there is a solid rock bottom to the river at that point, and that it will be necessary either to blast out a part of that rock bottom or build out some sort of a structure into the river where the boats may land the freight that is brought up and down the river.

Now, I want simply to state this, in conclusion, if I may have a minute further: It seems to me an idle policy to appropriate millions of dollars annually for the improvement of the Mississippi River channel and then refuse to appropriate any money to make it possible for the boats to land at the towns along the river. What are we improving the channel for, if it is not to permit the boats to land and to take on and put off freight? Are they simply to pass up and down the river in this channel that we are spending so many millions in improving? It seems to me that if there is any argument in favor of improving these waterways, it carries with it the fact that we ought to improve the landings.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. SUMNERS. Would it be a feasible scheme to depend on the community there to improve their own landing, or would the expense be too great for that?

Mr. McKENZIE. I think it would be too great a burden, and I do not think it would be just.

I might add this word: Some years ago, to improve the channel, the engineers built a dam out in the river which the

people of Fulton say produced an eddy that filled up the landing place. The engineers of the Army, however, contradict that statement, and say that that is not the fact. But the fact remains that the landing has filled up with silt, and it is impossible for the boats to get up to the landing. I think, Mr. Chairman, if we are going to make appropriations at all, this is one of the items that would appeal to the judgment of any reasonable man.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. HULBERT. Is there a House document report on this proposed improvement?

Mr. McKENZIE. No, sir.

Mr. HULBERT. The gentleman has not introduced any bill or brought the matter to the attention of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors?

Mr. McKENZIE. No, sir. It came to my attention too late for that. I was under the impression that the Mississippi River Commission had the right to use part of the money appropriated for that commission to be distributed for the improvement of the river.

Mr. HULBERT. There has not been any survey or authorization of a survey as to the exact necessities at that point?

Mr. McKENZIE. It is a project that has been under the jurisdiction of the War Department. In 1907 there was expended \$4,015 to improve this, and they said it was only temporary. To make it complete would cost \$20,000. I am asking now for an appropriation of only \$10,000.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, the amount that the Government has expended was for improving the channel of the river?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The gentleman's amendment is to appropriate money to construct or improve a landing?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That being the case, Mr. Chairman, I think it is clearly subject to a point of order.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors a brief question. Will he withhold the point of order for a moment?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. I notice various appropriations here, but I have not noticed any appropriation for Bubble Creek, in Chicago. Not that I am in favor of any appropriation for that great waterway, but I would like to know whether anyone came before the committee asking legislation to close that creek?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not recall any request of this kind.

Mr. SABATH. Not at this session?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Not at any time.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman knows that one branch of the Chicago River has been closed, and it is being closed now.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; I was not aware of that.

Mr. SABATH. No recommendation has been secured from the committee or from Congress on that subject?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not recall any at all.

Mr. SABATH. For the gentleman's information I wish to say that the people owning adjoining land have been filling in that creek and are now in the market to dispose of the property, and are ready to close the other branch, and are advertising for sale property which to my mind belongs to the Government.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Has the gentleman ever presented that matter to the War Department?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I wrote a letter to the War Department a year ago and they answered me that an application had been made for the closing of that creek, and that they understood it was being filled in, and that they did not believe anyone would raise any serious objection. I myself would not be opposed to closing that creek were it not for the fact that I do not believe those people should secure title to property which to my mind belongs to the Government.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If it is navigable water, they can not acquire title by filling it up without authority. They would have no legal authority to do that.

Mr. SABATH. I do not think they have. Will the gentleman advise me in what way to proceed, or will his committee aid me to bring about a condition whereby this land can be reclaimed from those who unlawfully hold it, and be turned over to the Government?

Mr. SPARKMAN. If I were in the gentleman's place, I would present the matter, as the gentleman no doubt has, to the War Department. If the War Department does not act, then I would present the matter to the United States district attorney,

because there is a statute prohibiting such acts and the courts have the authority to cause the removal of such obstructions.

Mr. SABATH. Has the Secretary of War the right to grant a permit to fill in any channel or creek which has been used and recognized as a navigable stream?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Congress alone can authorize the filling in of navigable water.

Mr. SABATH. It requires the action of Congress?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. Before anyone can obstruct or fill in any such navigable stream?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. HULBERT. Has it occurred to the gentleman that he might introduce a resolution asking for an investigation, have it referred to the proper committee, and request a hearing thereon?

Mr. SABATH. I wish to say to the gentleman that two years ago I introduced a resolution, with which the chairman of this committee is familiar, asking for a survey of the Chicago River and the Lake front, and showing the obstructions by private interests of the shores and rivers. The resolution was embodied in the bill two years ago, and for two years every month or six weeks I asked the Board of Engineers for a report, but up to this date I have not been able to secure it. That is the reason I am asking the chairman for advice, as to whether there is a way in which I can proceed to secure the information and to stop these people from doing these unlawful things, such as they are doing on George Lake, where the Steel Corporation is filling in that body of water without any warrant of law.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The War Department has ample jurisdiction to prevent all such trespasses as the gentleman mentions.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask a ruling on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOSTER). The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] makes a point of order on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE], on the ground that it is not germane to the bill. Does the gentleman desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. McKENZIE. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks this amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois does not come within the rule as to items in a river and harbor bill, being for the improvement of a landing. Therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement, not exceeding five minutes, with reference to a project which is not in this bill, but has been carried in the bill heretofore.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes to explain a matter which is not in this bill, but which has been in previous bills. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, heretofore there has been carried in the river and harbor bill a Trinity River item. In justice to my constituents and to the Members of the House I want to make a very brief statement with reference to that project. In the last Congress I was authorized to state to the Rivers and Harbors Committee that the people of Dallas and that vicinity would contribute \$3,000,000 toward the completion of the project if the Congress would make an appropriation covering the rest of the necessary expenditures. Since that proposition was made to the Congress the engineers having the matter under consideration have made a report in which they change the former estimate of \$6,000,000 for the completion of the project to about \$13,000,000. This report was made at about the beginning of this session of Congress. The local people interested, recognizing that Congress would probably require a larger contribution from them than that which they had formerly proposed to make, felt that they would require further time to investigate the matter and ascertain just what propositions they could make to Congress. Therefore, as the Representative of that district, I did not ask the Rivers and Harbors Committee to incorporate in this bill an item for the Trinity River. I make the statement for the purpose of explaining, in a measure at least, the absence of the item in the bill, and to explain to the Members of the House why the people of Dallas and vicinity have not proceeded further with reference to the \$3,000,000 proposition which they authorized me to make at the last Congress. I hope that when this bill comes before the committee again for consideration that I will be prepared to make the committee and Congress another definite proposition looking to the completion of this project.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I was not able to hear all the statement that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] made with relation to this matter, although I realize his very great interest in the improvement of Trinity River, as he has expressed it to the committee previously and also on the floor of the House. But in justice to myself and in the expectation of voting for the river and harbor bill when it comes to a vote to-day or to-morrow, as long as the question of the Trinity River has come up—and I am sorry it has come up—I wish to say that so far as I am personally concerned one of the reasons why I shall vote for the present river and harbor bill, and did not vote for the last one, is the fact that the Trinity River is left out. There were two or three similar propositions in the last river and harbor bill that are not in this bill.

When general debate was on a few days ago I stated that I thought there were fewer items to condemn in the present bill than in any bill during the last four years, and the omission of the Trinity River and the Brazos, and a few of the same kind, is one of the reasons why I made that statement.

Mr. SUMNERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes; with pleasure.

Mr. SUMNERS. I do not know whether the gentleman understood my statement—

Mr. TREADWAY. I did not hear all of it.

Mr. SUMNERS. My statement was in explanation of why we had not proceeded further with reference to the \$3,000,000 proposition that I made last year to your committee. I am going to present it when the river and harbor bill comes before Congress next year, and I hope the gentleman will put on the slow pedal in so far as prejudicing the Trinity River project is concerned.

Mr. TREADWAY. I will say that no member of the committee, certainly not myself, would in any way impugn the good intentions of the gentleman from Texas in thoroughly living up to any statement that he ever made to any of us, because we all appreciate the high character of the gentleman and his good faith in carrying out what he may promise to undertake.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mississippi River from Head of Passes to the mouth of the Ohio River, including salaries, clerical, office, traveling, and miscellaneous expenses of the Mississippi River Commission: Continuing improvement with a view to securing a permanent channel depth of 9 feet, \$6,000,000, which sum shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War in accordance with the plans, specifications, and recommendations of the Mississippi River Commission, as approved by the Chief of Engineers, for the general improvement of the river, for the building and protection of levees, at the localities under the jurisdiction of said commission, including the Ohio River from its mouth to the mouth of the Cache River, which may be done, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, by hired labor or otherwise, and for surveys, including the survey from Head of Passes to the headwaters of the river, in such manner as in their opinion shall best improve navigation and promote the interests of commerce at all stages of the river: *Provided*, That of the money hereby appropriated so much as may be necessary shall be expended in the construction of suitable and necessary dredge boats and other devices and appliances and in the maintenance and operation of the same.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I make this motion for the purpose of calling the attention of the committee to the act of 1916, which carried a paragraph providing that any funds in that act or which may hereafter be appropriated by Congress for the improvement of the Mississippi River between Head of Passes and the Ohio River, and which might be allotted to levees, might be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War on any part of the river between Head of Passes and Rock Island, Ill.

This paragraph in the bill I have no doubt intends to carry out this provision which is now a part of the law of the land. In the event that this bill should fail in the Senate and a lump sum should be appropriated, and any part of the lump sum should be allotted for levees on the Mississippi River, the clause in the act of 1916 would undoubtedly come into operation, and appropriations for levees on the Mississippi River would also be expended for levees on the upper part as far as Rock Island.

If the bill should become a law, it is a question in my mind whether this paragraph would permit the expenditure of the \$6,000,000 that might be allotted to levees on the upper Mississippi River as far off as Rock Island. The paragraph provides for an appropriation to be expended on the Mississippi River from Head of Passes to the mouth of the Ohio River. Then later on in the paragraph it authorizes the engineers to use a part of this money for the general improvement of the river and a part of it for completing and for the protection of levees at the localities under the jurisdiction of the said commission. The commission has never exercised jurisdiction, until the act of

1916, over levees on the upper river. I want to suggest to the committee, knowing as I do that the committee intends that this section shall carry out the provisions of the law, the advisability of offering some committee amendment to make it plainer.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, to make the matter certain which the gentleman from Illinois thinks is uncertain, I will offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 17, page 31, after the first comma and before the word "for," insert the word "and," and after the word "levees," at the end of line 17 and before the comma, insert the words "between Rock Island, Ill., and Head of Passes."

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOSTER). The question is on the amendment.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I rise for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee why should the Government build levees along the Mississippi when it does not build levees along the Missouri? The Missouri is much more liable to overflow up above the mountains than the Mississippi in the same place.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In principle there is no difference as far as I can see, but it has been supposed all along that the necessities were greater on the Mississippi River than on the Missouri River.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. To go a little further, why should the Government, which is supposed to be working simply in the interest of navigation, build levees for either of them?

Mr. SPARKMAN. On the Mississippi and on some other rivers, but especially the Mississippi, that part between the mouth of the Ohio and the Head of Passes, it has been supposed, and is yet supposed, that the building of levees is to some extent in the interest of navigation.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. On what theory?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Upon the theory that there is a tendency always to wash new channels and fill up the old channels. But reversion is more in the interest of navigation, but that is hardly a response to the question asked by the gentleman.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That would be true as to the Missouri River also.

Mr. SPARKMAN. My own individual opinion is that the building of levees along the banks of the river has very little to do with and affords very little protection to navigation. The main thing, of course, as we all know, is the protection of property against overflows from floods that come from above. And I want to say another thing right there—that the country has acquiesced in, indeed, has advocated, that class of improvement on that part of the river on the theory that the water coming from other States above overflows the lands below, causing great damage to property, and that the country at large ought to contribute, along with the people there, toward the protection against those floods.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Then this is a reclamation project in part?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Very largely, though it is somewhat in the interest of navigation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 31, line 12, strike out the figure "6" and insert the figure "1."

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I listened a few moments ago to the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] in regard to this bill as he compared it with its predecessor which contained the item for the Trinity River. I differ with him in judgment as to the merits of the two bills. However, that is a matter of individual judgment. I can not understand how anyone after examining the 80 new projects that have been put into this bill can come to any conclusion that this bill is better than the other, notwithstanding that the Brazos and the Trinity and other projects are out. There are many items pointed out to-day along this line as vicious as any ever proposed in any river and harbor bill.

The amendment which I offer is an old one and I presume it will not be acted upon favorably by the committee, because the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] and myself conducted a heroic though very ineffective campaign against the flood-control bill. At that time we believed, at least I did, and I take it that he did, that the Government has no right under the present order of things, under the present character of improvements that have been conducted, to reclaim land along the lower Mississippi River. I can submit and will submit extended

remarks upon this subject showing that there is no question that most of this money is being used for the reclamation of lands or for the building of levees and revetments and things of that character. For navigation that river is the finest in the country; it has a splendid channel, as we have been told by Mr. BARNHART and all who use the channel. I will not refer to the commerce, because that has been discussed so many times; but I do say that it occurs to me that is a fair proportion of the amount that would be needed for an open channel, but I do not pretend to base any judgment upon it beyond that, and it is for the purpose of registering a protest against the use of Government money for the reclamation of lands along the lower Mississippi River.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. SWITZER. The gentleman, as I recall, has asserted that if these items were to come in before the House by themselves they would likely not meet with the approval of Congress. Is it not a fact that this item for the lower Mississippi was segregated together with a bill for the Sacramento, and that it passed this House by a vote of 150 to 53, and that both of the items had been denounced by the gentleman, as well as by Senator Burton, as being exclusively reclamation projects; and is it not a fact that the gentleman was unable to get a record vote upon the two propositions that passed in the first session of this Congress?

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct in every particular. The bill is not yet through the Senate, however. I do not know but that it may go through. However, it will probably get a record vote, and it will not be unanimous. I believe, however, that unless we want to stand committed to the policy of reclaiming lands, we should adopt this amendment. I concede that this is a case that merits attention among the first if we undertake private-land reclamation, but I have been opposed to it because I believe it to be wrong in principle. If the California proposition had not gone along with it, I doubt whether it would have had nearly the vote finally received. That is neither here nor there. I move to strike this out because the larger portion of the money, which is similar to that carried in the \$45,000,000 flood-control bill, is for land-reclamation purposes.

UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER WASTE—\$28,000,000 APPROPRIATED FOR WHAT?—THE UPPER RIVER HAS BEEN SURRENDERED TO A POWER COMPANY THAT CONTROLS AND PREVENTS NAVIGATION—\$27,000,000 OF GOVERNMENT MONEY HAS BEEN LARGELY WASTED ON THE UPPER RIVER, WHICH IS ONLY A FRACTION OF \$150,000,000 APPROPRIATED FOR THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER DURING PAST YEARS TO OBTAIN A WATERWAY.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to submit notes gathered on a trip taken down the Mississippi River in August, 1916. I have lived on or near the river for many years, have boated the river during much of that time, and believe that the statement submitted gives an accurate understanding of actual conditions on the upper Mississippi River to-day. I offer herewith the testimony of many witnesses.

By preface, it was no ride at Government expense or through the courtesy of anyone, but was taken in order to have first-hand knowledge of a 700-mile section of the Mississippi River on which we have spent \$27,000,000, during which time commerce has decreased 90 per cent, and yet navigation has never been more dangerous nor obstructed for reasons specifically set forth.

No conscious bias beyond that developed by facts presented exists, and I may further add that I traveled at my own expense, had no letters of introduction, and was unacquainted with a single officer or pilot of the boat or company when I took passage at St. Paul. Further I will say that other river pilots with whom I am acquainted, and who are among my own constituents, have confirmed the judgment herein expressed, and strongly commend the efforts to bring facts and the enormous waste of money to public attention.

After several years' study of river and harbor legislation, I am convinced that the cancer of waterway waste, reaching hundreds of millions of dollars, has its seat in the region of the country drained by the rivers of the Mississippi Valley. Waste occurs elsewhere in creeks, rivers, and bays all along the different coasts, but in the Mississippi Valley occurs waste that annually reaches a dozen millions or more. For this reason I invite attention to one project, typical of many, which discloses where the fault lies and how far afield we have drifted from the actual needs of navigation.

The criticisms are intended to be helpful, and I am prepared to admit that Congress is primarily responsible for results, because it has blindly followed recommendations of those who

neither by training, taste, nor experience are fitted for the practical side of navigation or business methods. This does not impugn the honest motives of men nor the integrity of officials, but we should face the facts and assume our own share of responsibility.

MEMORANDA OF DATA AFFECTING THE UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER FROM ST. PAUL TO ST. LOUIS, GATHERED ON A TRIP DURING THE MONTH OF AUGUST, 1916.

We left St. Paul Thursday night, August 24, on the steamer *St. Paul*, Capt. Day in charge, with about 120 passengers aboard. The visible freight consisted of two automobiles, a Ford machine carried part way, a few boxes of soap, possibly 20 or 30 in number, and several cases of beer and Bevo, destined for river points in Iowa. The boat has 1,200 tons capacity, but carried less than 50 tons of freight, including weight of passengers and baggage.

The *St. Paul* is the largest boat on the river. It is about 270 feet in length, 74 feet in width, and draws 3½ feet or 5 feet when fully loaded. Remained on deck practically all of each day, and the first traffic boat seen on the river, aside from Government craft marked "U. S.," was a little towboat with a small barge of sand. This we passed below Clinton, 354 miles distant from St. Paul, on Saturday, August 26, at a point practically half way from St. Paul to St. Louis. It was reported that we passed the first boat at Dubuque during the night at a point 289 miles below St. Paul. On the trip down we passed probably 20 or more boats marked "U. S." tied up on shore or engaged in work along the river. Some of these were flatboats loaded with stone or brush; several dredges, most of which were idle, and two dredges belonging to the Burlington Road, near La Crosse, were also passed along the river.

With the exception of Government work boats the river was practically deserted from daylight to dark. Our boat whistled alone for landings or drawbridges. I was informed by officials of the boat that there is very little river traffic found on the upper Mississippi River.

The captain of the *St. Paul*, Capt. A. O. Day, a man of high standing, has traveled on the river for over 30 years. He formerly owned boats on the river and related many instances of his struggle with railway companies, which have now captured all the river freight. As stated, his boat, the *St. Paul*, is the largest on the upper Mississippi River, and is reported in the folder to have a 1,200-ton capacity, but she didn't appear to carry more than a dozen tons on the trip, apart from passengers and baggage.

BOATS RUN 12 WEEKS EACH YEAR.

The *St. Paul* is maintained by the passenger business, which ceases about September 1, when school term begins. It made 7 round trips during 1916 in a season of less than 12 weeks, and is the largest of several boats run by the Streckfus Line, largely for excursion business. Our boat easily passed over bars of 4 feet, when the measurements were called out by the pilot, but we were stuck on several bars below Keokuk and landed 17 hours late in St. Louis. Capt. Day said that before improvements were made on the river an average depth of about 6 feet in the channel was usually maintained during the boating season. At that time fully 130 boats were on the upper river. For some years the number has been growing less, until in 1916 probably not more than a dozen boats are engaged in actual regular river traffic, and of these the Streckfus Co. has three passenger boats and two excursion boats in use. As before stated, all the boats rely on excursion business for support, and none are serious freight or passenger competitors of the railways which run along both banks of the river.

A significant statement made by Capt. Day, of this the largest boat on the upper Mississippi River, is to the effect that after Government expenditures made on the upper Mississippi River—now aggregating over \$27,000,000—the river is in worse condition than before the expenditure of a dollar was made. One evidence pointed out lies in the poor channels and vastly increased dangers now incurred. Capt. Day indicated sunken wing dams along the river, some of which were afterwards taken out by the Army engineers, who first put them in. No lights were on these wing dams as a rule, and they are a constant menace to pilots at certain stages of the river. Of course the menace is not so widespread since the 130 boats have diminished to approximately 10 per cent of the number formerly on the river.

FOUR-FIFTHS OF THE MONEY HAS BEEN WASTED.

Enormous waste of Government funds was pointed out on every side in order to verify some old or new theory. I asked Capt. Day how much money was needed for the maintenance of a channel in the upper Mississippi River, according to his best judgment. His answer, given in the presence of others, was

significant. Dividing the 700 miles of the upper Mississippi River, from St. Paul to St. Louis, into six districts, he said \$30,000 would be sufficient to run every single district, or a total of \$180,000 annually, for the upper river.

Asked what was being done with the \$1,500,000 now annually dumped into the river, an amount nearly ten times that required for actual navigation, he declared little permanent benefit had been secured by the vast expenditure of \$27,000,000, and reiterated that in many respects the river was more easily navigable before this expenditure had been made.

This judgment is not from an irresponsible or immature man seeking to carry out a theory. It is the conviction of a riverman of vast experience who is running the largest boat and one of the very few boats left on the river. Other rivermen and pilots gave similar opinions, although not always with equal frankness.

A SPECIFIC INDICTMENT OF CRIMINAL CARELESSNESS.

At Keokuk our boat dropped 30 feet in the locks so that the upper part was 15 feet below the level of the canal-lock walls. When down in the four-walled pit the captain said that in case of fire the Government has made no provision for saving passengers. No fire apparatus is on the adjoining walls, which walls are controlled by a private power company. No chance of escape is offered to passengers or crew, and sometimes 1,000 excursionists are carried on a single boat through the lock. The only method of reaching the top wall is by a little iron ladder 1 foot wide. Caught by fire, flood, or other disaster within this 30-foot four-walled cellar, passengers would be helpless, like rats in a trap.

The boat is in the lock only for a few minutes at a time during which to guard against accident, but as boat officials said, "We need an *Eastland* disaster to get relief from the Keokuk Dam menace." Ladders and fire apparatus should be provided either by the Government or power company and protection should be provided without delay.

Another fact appears to be notoriously in evidence. The Keokuk Dam has been turned over to a private company by the Government. Col. Hoffman is in charge of this part of the river. Many tales of his orders and pronouncements were related by different pilots and engineers, running from his efficiency record, when he cut the wages of men in two, in order to make a showing to his superiors, down to his arbitrary dealings with rivermen, none of whom apparently give him a good word. Possibly they were prejudiced, but the river is primarily for navigation, and the power company and engineers are now the appellant court to which rivermen must appeal.

While instructions require that dam gates be opened so as to maintain sufficient water for navigation, it is cheaper for this private power company to generate electricity with a 30-foot head than with one of 25 feet, and so river soundings in the channel a few miles below Keokuk frequently showed only 3, 4, and 5 feet depths, which were called off in my hearing.

CONGRESS TO BLAME FOR POOR NAVIGATION.

Cooper Lake is a backwater formed by the Keokuk Dam of some 60 miles length and about a mile in width. When we went through the dam the water on the upper side, where the power is generated, was reported as at its usual level. We were dropped about 30 feet in the lock, and from the dam down to Alton we hobbled over sand bars, with occasional involuntary stops, totaling 17 hours' delay, before we reached St. Louis. At that point readings were presented to me showing that the Keokuk Power Co. monopoly not only dams the greatest river in the world and sells its power at top-notch figures but it also obstructs and prevents navigation on a river which has thus far swallowed up \$27,000,000 in public funds. The Keokuk Power Co. lobby, like the Muscle Shoals Power lobby, on the Tennessee River, does not waste its time with Congress after securing a great public right for its private purpose; but what answer can be made to the charge of rivermen that both Congress and the Keokuk Dam need an intimate acquaintance with the facts when both, acting with the Army engineers, have practically destroyed navigation on the upper Mississippi River excepting during two or three of the earlier months of the year.

The Government wastes much time and effort in protecting navigation on mud creeks throughout the country, and Congress betrays interest wherever a railroad bridge or other obstruction is proposed on streams little or big, but on the greatest river in the world we close our eyes to the Keokuk Dam and to real needs of navigation.

PLENTY OF WATER, SO RESPONSIBILITY IS CLEAR.

Plenty of water for navigation was found at St. Paul when we started on the trip, and for many miles below on the river, until

Keokuk was reached. The St. Croix, Chippewa, Cedar, Wisconsin, and numerous other navigable rivers empty into the Mississippi; but after leaving Keokuk, below the dam, the river was shallow and neither wing dams, dredging boats, nor Army engineers have been able to relieve the situation. At different points along this part of the river the shallow condition exists, and the *Dubuque*, *Quincy*, and *St. Paul*, belonging to the Streckfuss Co., were repeatedly grounded. The Keokuk Dam benefits a private power company. I am informed this power is sold in St. Louis at the same cost that would be required if generated by coal and steam. It is a private monopoly, pure and simple, and has the privilege of damming the greatest river in the country. It seriously interferes with what little navigation remains. It was a piece of profligacy to give away to a private company this public right, and Congress is to be blamed for the situation which has been brought about.

Last year we appropriated \$1,500,000 for the river above St. Louis in order to keep contractors and Government employees busy on a useless job. The 1916 bill passed the House at \$1,200,000 after a hard fight. Champions of economy and of the people then went the House \$300,000 better and secured more money for the upper Mississippi, an extravagant project, which lacks navigation or boats with which to navigate. One million five hundred thousand dollars for the upper Mississippi in 1916 is at the rate of \$2,000 per mile, whereas, according to Capt. Day, \$180,000 for the 700-mile stretch would have done better work if properly used.

NINETY-NINE PER CENT GOES BY RAIL; WHY?

The situation is significant. From St. Paul, Minn., to St. Louis, a hundred or more river towns, little and big, are shipping hundreds of millions of tons of products annually. The amount is so large it would be hard to accurately estimate, but presumably 99 per cent of all that traffic is carried by the railways, while the Government is spending millions of dollars every year on the Mississippi River without producing any result. Probably less than one-tenth of 1 per cent of the actual commerce along the river finds its way into an insignificant freight tonnage carried on the river. This is apart from sand, logs, and ferriage statistics which have figured in Army engineers' reports. The tonnage is carried by several boats, whereas a hundred or more boats were engaged in actual traffic throughout a large part of the year before Government improvements were begun. For this same traffic Army engineers in 1916 recommended \$2,000,000 for upper Mississippi River annual improvements, in addition to the \$27,000,000 already expended. The recommendation for \$2,000,000 is ten times the amount suggested by Capt. Day, who runs the largest boat on the river. What can better describe the unbusinesslike method of river improvements carried on by the Government than this very fact, and what further illustration is required to show hopeless results?

Engineers have asked for specific complaints of neglect or inefficiency. These are pointed out all along the river. Lights are supposed to be placed for steering so as to aid pilots, yet many of these are so obstructed by the surrounding brush and trees as to be of little use. I say this from personal observation. Light 288 is 65 miles past St. Louis. It could not be seen either from above or below because of surrounding foliage. My attention was directed to this and other lights by the pilots, who claimed to have made complaint of these conditions. The current is constantly shifting on the river. When Col. Hoffman was asked for targets to mark different reaches of the course, he was reported to have said, "We can not afford to place targets on every course," and yet Hoffman runs the division by efficiency methods, leaving pilots to run the course by guess.

"IMPROVEMENTS" HAVE INCREASED DANGER.

Take the buoy proposition. Hundreds of dams project out into the river, frequently sunken just below the surface and at angles of the river where no exact means exists of determining the end of the dangerous artificial reef by day or by night. Pilots pointed out this danger and said in reply to their demands for buoys only a limited number were furnished, and these were not placed until July, 1916, or at a time when the season was nearing its close. In one case, the pilot showed where he is obliged to steer by a snag in the center of the stream because the buoy, once established, had long since disappeared. It was said that a small boat with five men could establish all the buoys needed. Two boats would do the work on the upper river in proper shape, and yet the Government keeps a large fleet busy building mats, dams, and trailers parallel to the channel, while neglecting the most important part of present navigation.

In discussing experiments made by engineers, it was pointed out by pilots that on the Minnesota side of the river, below Winona, a dam was put in on one side of the river, then taken out because it was not giving anticipated results, and then again replaced on the first site. An experimental boat, one of these built by Army engineers, was pointed out. It draws, I am advised, 4 feet of water. The largest passenger boat on the river, the *St. Paul*, 1,200 tons, only draws 3½ feet when running light, but in building experimental towboats we provide 4-foot draft, whereas an important element to consider in river navigation is the advantage of a light-draft, practical boat.

BARGE ANTICIPATIONS AND REALIZATIONS.

Mr. Barnhart's barges have been heralded for years, but it is significant that not one of Barnhart's boats is on the upper river. They are run by screws and, in the judgment of river men, there is no more show for a commercial screw boat on the river than for a battleship on the Trinity River in Texas. Not enough water and too much bottom to the river explains the situation. Such barges can not back up and are of no possible use on the upper river, according to every practical river man with whom I consulted, and yet they are heralded by river lobbies which are interested solely in procuring large appropriations. Barnhart was promised 600,000 tons of merchandise by merchants on the lower river if he would put a line of barges to New Orleans. When he went after the freight with his first barge, I am informed he secured a total of four carloads. He also went to St. Paul after river freight with his unloaded barge and they gave him bouquets, banquets, and fine words. New Orleans and St. Paul were strong on promises, but railways continue to carry the freight and Barnhart recuperated last summer in the quiet surroundings of a sanatorium, reflecting upon the uncertainties of Mississippi River navigation. No regular boat line runs from St. Louis to New Orleans, I was informed, but \$6,000,000 or more is annually spent for the lower river, \$325,000 for the middle stretch and \$1,500,000 more on the upper. No noticeable freight is carried on the upper river outside of the misleading statistics. That is our Government's ledger account for an expenditure on the upper and the lower Mississippi River, already reaching \$150,000,000.

FROM THE MEN WHO USE THE RIVER.

When in St. Louis I visited the Streckfus Co.'s officers, who were all strangers to me, and asked what complaints, if any, they had made as to conditions. Reports of gauge readings were shown, verifying the statements made by captains and pilots of water held back by the Keokuk Dam Co., which resulted in a 17-hour delay on bars below Keokuk for our boat, which drew only 3½ feet that trip. A statement from practically all the boat lines on the upper river is appended to show that criticism is not confined to one or two captains or pilots. These are the men for whom Congress is supposed to be appropriating millions of money annually on the Mississippi River for navigation purposes. Is their petition worth considering? Let me add the letter and petitions were not solicited. Upon being informed of conditions I stated that the matter could best be reached by petition from those using the river. Petitions are to their Representatives in Missouri and Illinois.

Letter was received while away from home and I am trying at this time to refer their communications to the proper department at Washington—Congress—which alone can get action. I trust their petition will get more attention than others sent to local officers, which have passed unrecognized, according to their report.

I assume these petitions have been transmitted in like manner to other Members, but in any event they speak for themselves.

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL.

STRECKFUS STEAMBOAT LINE,
St. Louis, Mo., September 21, 1916.

Hon. J. A. FREAR, M. C.,

Hudson, Wis.

DEAR SIR: I, as secretary of the Steamboat Owners' Association, of St. Louis, Mo., who own, control, and run steamers upon the Mississippi River out of St. Louis, am handing you two copies (each different) of signed petitions (the originals of same are filed with this association) and await your wishes, when needed. They are also signed by many captains and pilots who have traversed this upper river.

These petitions, with your comments, should at once be referred by you to the proper department at Washington for immediate action.

We ask that you kindly furnish us with a copy of your letters to the department. The attention this river is getting, and has been getting this year, is unbearable.

I thank you, await your immediate reply, and beg to remain,

Yours, very truly,

JOS. STRECKFUS,
Secretary Steamboat Owners' Association
of St. Louis, Mo.

PETITION 1.

St. Louis, Mo., September 21, 1916.

To the honorable Members of Congress States of Missouri and Illinois (on and along the Mississippi River from St. Louis, Mo., north), Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: We, the undersigned steamboat men, have tried hard to make river navigation and transportation upon the Mississippi River north of St. Louis, Mo., a success, but it seems without avail.

Your Mr. A. E. Richards, assistant United States engineer, stationed at Hannibal, Mo., is, in our opinion, thoroughly incompetent and unreliable. He is apt and willing to cover up things he has failed to do, etc., but to actually aid us, one and all, he positively is the limit.

We respectfully ask for his transfer for this river and for the betterment of the service; his resignation, however, would be preferable.

We need action and attention on the Mississippi River during the early months of the year, not wait until September and October, when most all river traffic has ceased.

All this matter has been repeatedly called to the attention of Maj. Hoffman at Rock Island, Ill. He pays no attention to the same, has excuses, and has failed to ever notify us of any attention or investigation he or his office has ever given same. This data is needed by us.

The Mississippi River for navigation needs a competent set of men to manage same and to be on the job more of the time than off, as is apparent to people who have to and do run the river daily.

William Bush, pilot; Selby H. Crader, pilot; G. T. Williams, pilot; Jas. Phillips, pilot; J. E. Short, pilot; R. M. Streckfus, master *Sidney*; D. H. Dippel, pilot; J. H. Laycock, pilot and master; Eugene Sprinkle, pilot; H. Woodruff, pilot; B. A. Burns, pilot; John W. Warren, master and pilot; Jos. Streckfus, master; Streckfus Steamboat Line, John Streckfus, president; *Belle of Calhoun*, O. W. Sebastian, owner; Jos. Streckfus, secretary; Capt. B. J. Winters; John W. Warren, master and pilot; John Streckfus, jr., master; John Streckfus, master.

A second petition is also submitted, which I find verifies the notes made on the trip down the Mississippi. Here are shown repeated evidences of neglect and arrogance that would not be permitted in any other department of the Government.

PETITION 2.

St. Louis, Mo., September 20, 1916.

To the honorable Members of Congress States of Missouri and Illinois (on and along the Mississippi River from St. Louis, Mo., north), Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: We, the undersigned steamboat men, find the lighthouse service upon the Mississippi River from St. Louis north in a very bad, unsafe, and unsatisfactory condition.

We need more buoys, markings, lights, etc., and the attention given the river is inadequate and inexcusable. In fact, it is deplorable and dangerous, steamers grounding daily.

We ask that you proceed and have the lighthouse system on the Mississippi River north of Missouri River taken out of the United States Engineering Department (Maj. Hoffman, at Rock Island, Ill.) and placed back in the Lighthouse Department, where it formerly was, and furnish a lighthouse tender to do nothing else but attend to the lights and lighthouse duty, attending to same at all times, and not lay up on shore most of the time.

This needs immediate attention, and continual attention, not a few spurts now and then, but all the time, all the year navigation is on; and we want daily or trip reports of same. We haven't gotten a report of soundings and changes of channel, etc., for at least two years past. We want them and need them positively, the same as is furnished river men from St. Louis down by the Lighthouse Service steamer.

Wm. Bush, pilot; Selby H. Crader, pilot; G. T. Williams, pilot; Jas. Phillips, pilot; J. E. Short, pilot; R. M. Streckfus, master steamer *Sidney*; D. H. Dippel, pilot; J. H. Laycock, pilot and master; Eugene Sprinkle; H. Woodruff, pilot; B. A. Burns, pilot; John W. Warren, master and pilot; Jos. Streckfus, master; Streckfus Steamboat Line, by John Streckfus, president; Eagle Packet Co., by Henry W. Leyhe, manager; *Belle of Calhoun*, by O. W. Sebastian, owner; Steamboat Owners' Association of St. Louis, by Henry W. Leyhe, president; Steamboat Owners' Association of St. Louis, by Jos. Streckfus, secretary; Madison Coal Corporation (tugs), by Roy Parker, captain; Capt. R. J. Winters; John Streckfus, jr., master; John Streckfus, master.

THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER FROM THE MISSOURI TO THE OHIO—WHERE HAS EIGHTEEN MILLIONS GONE?

This stretch of 200 miles has received from the Government in appropriations \$18,164,855, based on the recommendation of Government engineers. The pending bill carries \$350,000, or \$1,750 per mile for this short stretch of river.

Senator Burton is authority for the statement made in Congress that we have expended more money on this 200 miles of river than has been expended by the German Government on the Rhine. The commerce on the Rhine reaches many millions of tons annually. That shown on the middle section of the Mississippi River, according to St. Louis commercial reports, is insignificant.

Three sections of the river are presented briefly to show where our \$130,000,000 of taxpayers' money spent on the Mississippi has been used under the recommendations of Government engineers and results achieved by that expenditure. Surely, it is a lesson in waste and mismanagement that calls for some better system and more economical administration.

ON THE LOWER MISSISSIPPI—PROFLIGATE WASTE RUN RIOT.

Over \$100,000,000 has been spent by the Government on this project, including the Passes, of which amount \$88,159,555 was

appropriated from the Ohio River south to the Passes. After the enormous sum of money had been expended on the lower river, I quote from an address by the Chief of Engineers made before a waterway congress, December 7, 1916, a few weeks ago, wherein he says:

On the Mississippi River we have an improved waterway of ample depth and sufficient width and open the year round from St. Louis to New Orleans; but it is only just within the last year or two that that waterway began again to be used and used in a rational way.

In passing down the Mississippi from St. Louis to New Orleans two weeks ago we left St. Louis one morning early. The same day a barge load of freight left St. Louis. All the way down the Mississippi River we saw that barge loaded at intervals. Finally we reached New Orleans, and the barge load of freight got there at exactly the same time. * * * Later I saw the manager of the barge line and he told me that, although this enterprise of theirs is but a new one and as yet is little known, it is to-day making money. [Applause.] Such a development when started is bound to go on.

PLAYING TAG WITH A BARGE.

After an expenditure by the Government of over \$80,000,000 of taxpayers' money on this lower 1,000-mile stretch of the river, or at the rate of \$80,000 per mile, we are informed that the lower Mississippi River is still in good shape for navigation. More than this, ocular demonstration of the fact was had that a boat was running on the river; it was seen. And according to the statement made before a rivers and harbors congress the engineers' boat kept up near the freight barge and saw it "all the way down the Mississippi."

In fact, the Government boat played tag all the way down the river with the only barge now running from St. Louis to New Orleans.

A boat has arrived. If the \$6,000,000 given by the Government annually to reclaim private lands along this stretch of the river is wisely valued by landowners who are benefited, that barge will be kept going as an advertisement of the fact that after an expenditure of fabulous sums of public money, the river will still float boats as in days of yore when "improvements" were unknown. Hundreds of boats that once ran from St. Louis to New Orleans have vanished with the old oxen teams, but one barge has been discovered, and the Chief of Engineers kept his eye on that barge all the way down the Mississippi.

Can any greater exposition of the absurdity of the lower Mississippi River commerce be presented than a bare statement of facts offered by the Government official named, and can any greater evidence of waste of public funds be presented anywhere than that disclosed by appropriations aggregating over \$88,000,000 for a stream which has lost its once great commerce, but thanks to Providence and an annual injection of from \$6,000,000 to \$8,000,000 by the Government, a new barge has been constructed which floats and carries freight.

The lower Mississippi appropriation is not for navigation, but is used toward a 16,000,000-acre private-land reclamation project.

A HUGE LAND-RECLAMATION SCHEME.

Any man who desires confirmation of the purpose of the Mississippi land-reclamation scheme will find it fully expressed in the following statement from the 1912 report of the Mississippi River Commission, page 3724:

While the levees have a certain degree of utility in the improvement of the channel and are necessary to "promote the interests of commerce" by providing landing places for the interchange of traffic in times of flood and protecting the lines of railway behind them, their immediate and main value is the protection of the alluvial lands for the benefit of their owners.

What need be added to this unqualified admission by an official agent of the parties in interest?

Quoting from a comprehensive brief in the United States Supreme Court of Hon. B. E. Moses, of Memphis, he says in this connection:

This so-called protection of the alluvial lands along the Mississippi River is primarily and fundamentally a work of "reclamation," as that term is generally understood. * * * The history of the levee system along the Mississippi River is merely a repetition of the fight of mankind from time immemorial to reclaim for cultivation the fertile alluvial plains of the rivers of the world. The futility of the fight under the past method of "levees only" is apparent and real and has been impressed upon the people of the valley during the floods of the last two years by ruin, starvation, and death, incident to the breaks in the levee system.

The Government is reclaiming lands that were never before used, and for the benefit of private interests. This purpose is not disputed by any recognized authority, so far as I can ascertain.

It is cloaked under the title of "flood control," "navigation," and other delusive terms, but with the best channel in its history, without producing any commerce, this bill taxes the people for \$6,000,000 profligate waste on the lower Mississippi.

WHAT HAS \$28,012,091 BOUGHT FOR US?

On January 13, 1916, about a year ago, on pages 1125 and 1126 of the Record, I gave a statement of upper Mississippi traffic, which is based on the Chief of Engineer's Report for 1914. This same official in the 1916 report recommends \$2,000,000 more for the 700-mile upper Mississippi River stretch, and asks that it be placed in the pending bill. He further reports on hand for this upper-river project on June 30, 1916, \$1,589,832. Remembering that the Government had appropriated for this 700-mile stretch of Mississippi River above the mouth of the Missouri \$28,012,091, or \$4,000 per mile, the following statement based on official reports shows how that great sum of money has been wasted in order to carry out a theory and maintain a regiment of employees.

The opinions of river men, steamboat owners, captains, and pilots, together with petitions, have been presented in order to get the public view of engineering inefficiency and extravagance. Let us now read the confessions as disclosed from official reports. I here repeat that part of my remarks of January 13, 1916, which bear directly on the waste of money along the upper Mississippi.

"PROFLIGATE WASTE."

Keeping in mind that actual commerce on the river has probably decreased 95 per cent during the past few years, during which time over \$25,000,000 of Government funds has been dumped into this 700-mile stretch of river, let us see how the Chief of Engineers excuses an allotment in 1915 of an even million in addition to the balance on hand and in addition to approximately \$30,000 per mile already spent on this project. Examine his statement of commerce, taken from page 2437 of the Chief of Engineer's Report for 1914.

The report says the quantity of freight carried by all boats, including the rock and brush used in Government work and also including logs and lumber floated down the stream, is as follows, and then follows a table, of which 772,392 tons hauled 9,445,576 ton-miles, valued at \$781,897, is for material used by the Government in improving the river.

Upper Mississippi River freight statement for 1913.

Designation.	Short tons.	Ton-miles.	Valuation.
Logs.....	64,489	30,245,340	\$315,271
Rafted lumber, shingles, etc.....	13,570	4,400,147	190,001
Miscellaneous freight.....	1,294,884	12,229,310	31,417,968
United States material.....	772,392	9,445,576	781,897
Total.....	2,145,315	56,320,373	32,705,137

Classified freight traffic, 1913.

Articles.	Amount.		Valuation.	Average haul.	Ton-miles.
	Customary units.	Short tons.			
Apples.....	160,030 barrels.....	11,505	\$200,218	34.4	395,959
Automobiles.....	5,703.....	6,034	9,545,950	3.8	23,014
Brick.....	192,190 pieces.....	981	3,052	7.3	7,157
Brush.....	656,644 cubic yards.....	82,450	170,191	20.6	1,700,694
Cement.....	4,305 tons.....	4,305	34,378	9.9	425,790
Coal.....	26,236 tons.....	26,236	90,400	13.5	354,401
Corn.....	119,000 bushels.....	3,463	77,431	6.4	22,144
Farm produce.....	13,565 tons.....	13,565	359,319	23.5	318,900
Fish.....	6,539 tons.....	6,539	666,600	9.8	62,486
Gravel.....	268,103 cubic yards.....	398,179	195,242	9.1	3,621,435
Hay.....	2,615 tons.....	2,615	44,269	5.4	14,122
Lath.....	3,056,000 pieces.....	1,018	10,575	317.2	322,989
Live stock.....	58,954 head.....	28,713	5,218,730	6.6	190,202
Logs.....	8,904,380 feet b. m.....	98,268	463,631	316.2	31,074,221
Lumber.....	19,167,689 feet b. m.....	30,408	467,775	138.0	4,195,827
Merchandise.....	17,101 tons.....	17,101	2,107,830	126.9	217,089
Oats.....	3,550 bushels.....	55	1,775	1.0	55
Rock.....	535,143 cubic yards.....	708,066	562,077	11.3	7,976,674
Sand.....	430,173 cubic yards.....	562,040	209,143	4.7	2,653,545
Shells.....	11,428 tons.....	11,428	246,229	42.9	490,801
Shingles.....	622,000 pieces.....	65	1,866	1.3	85
Teams.....	23,501.....	26,609	6,540,900	1.7	46,537
Wheat.....	11,500 bushels.....	382	12,347	7.9	3,015
Wood.....	21,847 cords.....	34,248	108,213	16.4	560,885
Miscellaneous.....	71,042 tons.....	71,042	5,366,996	231.0	1,642,366
Total.....		2,145,315	32,705,137	26.2	56,322,373

A comparative statement of upper-river commerce is also offered by years, during which period \$25,000,000 have been expended by the Government on the advice of Army engineers. While the 1913 commerce was only about 35 per cent of that floated in 1885, it will be ascertained upon analysis that over nine-tenths of the 35 per cent floated in 1913 is bogus commerce,

or, assuming the 1885 commerce reported to have been legitimate, in 28 years river freight fell approximately 96 per cent.

Mississippi River: Mouth of the Missouri to St. Paul, Minn.
[From reports of the Chief of Engineers, War Department.]

	Tonnage.
1885	5,607,196
1886	3,200,000
1887	3,500,000
1888	3,750,000
1889	3,500,000
1890	4,200,000
1891	3,300,000
1892	3,750,000
1893	3,200,000
1894	2,975,000
1895	3,000,000
1896	2,250,000
1897	3,200,000
1898	2,800,000
1899	2,900,000
1900	2,400,000
1901	2,125,000
1902	1,900,000
1903	4,545,129
1904	4,534,539
1905	4,089,318
1906	3,847,319
1908	2,581,857
1909	1,916,114
1910	1,836,035
1911	2,081,566
1912	1,830,294
1913	2,145,315

[From Reports of the Chief of Engineers, War Department, 1904, vol. 2, p. 2157, and 1913, vol. 2, p. 2385.]

	Tonnage.
Average tonnage for years 1877 to 1903, inclusive	4,615,376
Tonnage in 1912	1,830,294
Decrease	2,785,082

Referring to the 1913 statement, let us briefly examine the items, which show some remarkable facts.

ENGINEERS' STATISTICS OF COMMERCE (?).

"Commerce" reached 2,145,315 tons in 1913, so the Chief of Engineers reports. Tons of what? Let us see:

	Tons.
Brush for river construction work	82,450
Gravel dredged from river	398,178
Rock for river work	708,000
Sand dredged from river	562,000
Logs that have floated for 50 years	98,268
Lumber and wood barged	64,408
Animals ferried across river	55,322
Automobiles ferried across river	6,034
	1,974,980

All could be floated in 2 or 3 feet of water, leaving 170,335 tons of questionable commerce remaining, which was hauled on an average of 26 miles or thereabouts.

What a legislative travesty when eleven-twelfths of the commerce for which \$1,000,000 was allotted by the Chief of Engineers is of that character. Who weighed the brush? Who weighed the logs? Who weighed the rocks, gravel, sand, and so forth, used in the river work? Where was it carried and for what purpose? Was it floated 1 mile or 10 miles? Who knows? Why measure Government material for river work, anyway?

A WONDERFUL SYSTEM IN VALUING "COMMERCE."

The Chief of Engineers says that 26,609 tons of horses were carried a mile and a half across the river, and their value was \$6,540,900, or one-fifth of the total. Other live stock carried across the river, he says, was valued at \$5,218,730; and then, to cap the climax, this report adds that 6,034 tons of automobiles ferried across the river were valued at \$9,545,950.

Nearly two-thirds of all the glowing commerce valuations on the upper Mississippi, including Government sand, rock, and gravel, turns out to be animals and automobiles ferried across the river.

Again, how much of the remaining 170,000 tons was repair material or Government supplies out of a total of 772,000 tons reported? How much was duplicated before it could boost a million-dollar allotment for the upper river?

QUADRUPPLICATIONS OF SAME FREIGHT STATISTICS.

Last session Chairman SPARKMAN was asked by Mr. CALLAWAY in debate if river tonnage passing different places was not often included in the Chief of Engineers' reports, and if it was not duplicated, to which the chairman frankly responded: "Oh, yes; it is duplicated, triplicated, and quadruplicated in some cases." With that indefinite rule of estimate, if 170,000 tons, not of Government materials but of actual commerce, still remained, but was quadruplicated in computation, it would actually amount to less than 45,000 tons, for which \$1,000,000 was given April 1 by the generous Chief of Engineers,

with an additional \$1,000,000 annual interest charge for past expenditures. Yet the little harbor of Ashland, in my own State, handled 5,623,000 tons during the same year, excluding 35,000 tons of logs, while the Superior-Duluth Harbor handled 46,875,416 tons, or about 1,000 tons to 1, if river estimates were quadrupled by our guardian of the Treasury, the Chief of Engineers.

What shall be said of an official who now demands \$2,000,000 annually for traffic that has decreased to an insignificant fraction of what it was 30 or 40 years ago? Comparatively no expenditures were then made on the upper river; \$2,000,000 annually now. What value can be attached to such flimsy statistics which serve as a basis for an expenditure of a million dollars annually?

From \$6 to \$16, depending on the basis of estimate, is the annual cost to the Government for every ton of actual commerce on the upper river, including river ferriage, and of that remaining "commerce" 22 per cent was shells and soft coal floated a few miles in barges. We could have built a permanent bridge in 1915 across the river with that million dollars or bought a hundred ferries, if need be, or could have built and stocked 50 miles of Government-owned railway, with something to show for the investment. Again, we could have built a fine highway from Minneapolis to St. Louis. Better still, and up to date, we could annually buy a half dozen Ford trucks to carry all the actual commerce on the river and turn a good part of the remaining nine hundred and ninety thousand-odd dollars back into the Treasury to help lighten war-tax burdens and save a depleted Treasury from bankruptcy. But scores of dredgers and contractors would have been without occupation. Reasonable channel work on the river is needed, but who can excuse this great waste?

In a public speech at St. Paul August 3, 1915, Senator Burton declared the present St. Paul to St. Louis stage of water of 4½ feet is greater than the Elbe's, and yet our river is without commerce. What has become of the \$25,000,000 spent on the upper Mississippi River? Who divided the money and who is behind the lobby that is now wildly shouting for more? Where is the commerce? Twenty-five million in 40 years for dredgers while we were losing our commerce.

NO COMMERCE PRESENT OR PROSPECTIVE.

Last session the bogus river commerce on the upper Mississippi was exposed. I have been criticized by Representatives from St. Paul and Minneapolis because of assumed disloyalty to my own section of the country. In other words, it was proper to denounce worthless southern expenditures, providing we overlooked northern waste. When it was demonstrated that Mississippi River commerce is a myth, the House was gravely assured that an experimental trip was to be made in 1915, and commerce would be rejuvenated by Mr. Bernhard, a New Orleans barge owner, who figuratively, could make water run up hill. Two barge lines had proved disastrous failures in recent years, but another commercial Ajax had been discovered, and he proposed to revolutionize economic laws.

Picture the situation. The Twin Cities receive or ship, possibly, several hundred million tons of commerce annually. The Government contributes nothing toward the expense, but, on the contrary, the Interstate Commerce Commission and State railway commissions are authorized to prevent freight extortion by controlling railway charges. On the other hand, before one dollar was ever expended on the river, over 40 years ago, several hundred boat arrivals occurred annually at St. Paul, but after an expenditure by the Government of some \$25,000,000 on the upper Mississippi River, commerce is comparatively non est, while nothing larger than a logger's batteau or an Indian canoe ever tried to get up to or go down river from Minneapolis.

The Chief of Engineers gives ridiculous commerce reports and rainbow promises to justify continuing extravagant expenditures; but this year St. Paul tried to enlist business men in furnishing freight for the Bernhard barge proposition, and I quote from a report to show how the mountain labored in order to bring forth a diminutive mouse. Ponder over this tremendous folly and ask yourselves what lunacy commission would report as of sound mind any business man guilty of the feeble judgment Congress has displayed with an annual investment of \$1,000,000 in this upper Mississippi River project. Every year it nestles in the barrel recommended by the Chief of Engineers and his army of dredgers and contractors. Why? Is it to offset the \$6,000,000 to \$7,000,000 annual lower river grab? Remember the following report is of possible, not actual, guaranteed river commerce, in anticipation of which Representatives waxed eloquent on this floor when the bill was before the House last session. I quote from the St. Paul Dispatch of August 12, 1915,

but have a fuller statement of the report, which only emphasizes the folly attending an expenditure of twenty-five millions on the upper Mississippi River:

[From the St. Paul Dispatch, Aug. 12, 1915.]

DEMAND IS SLIGHT FOR RIVER SHIPPING—ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE COMMITTEE FINDS 20 FIRMS USING WATER FREIGHT.

A report made to-day by a special committee of the Association of Commerce shows little demand at this time for river transportation. An estimated tonnage of 10,464 inbound and 2,472 outbound for one year was made to the committee by 20 out of 64 business firms.

THIRTY-SIX DO NO RIVER BUSINESS.

Thirty-six of the 64 firms said they could do no business by river transportation.

Eight shippers said they may be able to use the river, but were unable to make any definite statement. Several of the largest firms did not reply to the communication sent to them by the committee.

REPORT FOR A YEAR.

The tabulated report for a year showed from foreign ports by way of New Orleans 1,124 tons of freight would come in and only 7 tons go out. From Pacific and Atlantic ports, by way of New Orleans, 4,200 tons will come in and 1,715 go out.

Along the Mississippi River 2,704 tons could be picked up and 165 tons sent to the way points. From St. Louis to St. Paul the inbound is estimated at 606 tons and the outbound at 360. Pittsburgh and other points on the Ohio would send 1,830 and take 225 tons from St. Paul.

TOTAL TONNAGE 12,936.

The total tonnage is estimated by the 20 concerns at 12,936. This is the estimated amount of the business and not an estimate of all St. Paul firms.

For October 160 tons can be brought in by river and only 3 tons sent out.

The committee which made the investigation is composed of H. T. Quinlan, J. W. Cooper, C. E. Tuttle, C. H. Bigelow, C. J. McConville, Charles Patterson, H. S. Sommers, J. A. Seeger, J. A. Gregg, and J. Clair Stone.

Can anything be added to this tragic statement of a \$25,000,000 expenditure for a waterway that will float about 12,000 tons of commerce for St. Paul annually out of a hundred million tons and over handled by the Twin Cities? Some open-river expenditures ought to be made to provide for the small existing local freight, but \$40,000 per mile is a notorious waste of money directly chargeable to the Chief of Engineers.

COL. TOWNSEND'S CONFIRMATION—A REMARKABLE STATEMENT THAT DEMANDS ATTENTION.

Before presenting the Merchants' Exchange illuminating table of commerce I desire to quote briefly from a speech made by Col. C. McD. Townsend, Army engineer and president of the Mississippi River Commission. Incidentally, the address was delivered before the \$50,000,000 annual river lobby that recently held its annual round-up in this city. He said, page 215, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sixty-fourth Congress:

St. Louis for the past 50 years has been the principal origin or terminus of the traffic on our western rivers, and its records summarize their tendencies. Its river commerce attained its maximum of 2,120,000 tons in 1880, and has since steadily declined to 153,000 tons in 1914. In contrast it may be stated that the commerce at Sault Ste. Marie, the outlet to Lake Superior, in 1880 was 1,300,000 tons, and attained a maximum of 79,000,000 tons in 1913. The commerce of New York Harbor exceeds 125,000,000 tons.

Shipments and receipts of freight at St. Louis by rail and specified rivers, 1890-1913.

[Compiled from the St. Louis Merchants' Exchange reports.]

SHIPMENTS.

Year.	Upper Mississippi River.	Lower Mississippi River.	Missouri River.	Ohio River.	Total by river.	Total by rail.	Grand total.
	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.
1890.....	22,547	543,805	10,035	601,862	5,270,850	5,872,712	
1891.....	18,630	445,150	19,280	512,930	5,216,228	5,729,158	
1892.....	51,595	392,635	29,455	502,215	5,969,754	6,471,969	
1893.....	54,230	342,785	12,775	436,900	5,554,593	5,991,493	
1894.....	52,190	281,635	4,075	363,080	4,780,256	5,143,336	
1895.....	30,780	241,155	5,605	303,355	5,349,327	5,652,682	
1896.....	31,510	508,960	1,355	572,410	5,400,728	5,973,138	
1897.....	36,225	406,315	469,365	6,137,265	6,606,630	
1898.....	33,805	339,435	300	399,583	7,079,319	7,478,902	
1899.....	33,675	151,135	203,205	8,266,393	8,469,598	
1900.....	36,675	187,385	1,225	245,580	9,180,309	9,425,889	
1901.....	23,392	158,493	7,185	209,271	10,653,065	10,862,336	
1902.....	23,130	174,517	4,840	224,266	11,035,586	11,259,852	
1903.....	44,855	146,498	2,345	212,207	12,971,173	13,183,380	
1904.....	21,775	46,320	2,620	82,565	13,731,194	13,813,759	
1905.....	25,730	35,295	4,705	80,575	15,225,973	15,306,548	
1906.....	36,000	34,905	3,565	89,185	17,672,006	17,761,191	
1907.....	25,155	35,550	3,095	78,500	18,296,416	18,574,916	
1908.....	27,280	30,285	5,320	72,740	15,700,568	15,772,893	
1909.....	16,695	21,140	48,005	17,153,097	17,201,102	
1910.....	12,510	24,815	11,100	20,187,270	20,235,695	
1911.....	11,270	38,150	415	67,465	17,974,337	18,041,802	
1912.....	9,025	24,330	9,940	20,368,613	20,411,908	
1913.....	8,830	20,000	7,284	11,470	22,129,175	22,176,759	

* From 1907 to 1913, inclusive, the tonnage given under the head of the Ohio River include the Illinois, Cumberland, and Tennessee Rivers also.

*Corrected.

Shipments and receipts of freight at St. Louis, etc.—Continued.

RECEIPTS.

Year.	Upper Mississippi River.	Lower Mississippi River.	Missouri River.	Ohio River.	Total by river.	Total by rail.	Grand total.
	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.
1890.....	128,960	222,075	21,350	102,500	663,730	9,969,291	10,633,021
1891.....	90,865	209,095	25,065	63,890	592,140	10,098,729	10,690,869
1892.....	135,435	212,545	13,065	96,930	687,200	11,229,005	11,916,205
1893.....	111,710	216,300	8,000	33,490	599,405	10,408,039	11,007,444
1894.....	111,400	219,195	5,480	35,375	583,510	9,512,910	10,096,420
1895.....	78,170	239,690	3,270	35,440	508,830	10,489,344	10,998,174
1896.....	61,165	345,105	1,245	62,640	671,765	10,763,116	11,434,881
1897.....	51,435	311,540	250	26,915	576,670	11,921,279	12,497,949
1898.....	33,910	311,915	790	37,130	506,586	12,962,850	13,469,435
1899.....	45,410	238,140	565	39,440	466,610	14,805,872	15,272,482
1900.....	50,070	274,445	2,725	2,700	512,010	15,375,441	15,887,451
1901.....	68,470	233,885	3,860	57,315	462,805	17,433,523	17,896,328
1902.....	38,005	248,905	6,030	59,890	416,920	18,090,809	18,477,729
1903.....	32,705	160,085	1,415	111,435	340,410	21,580,403	21,920,813
1904.....	25,405	132,585	2,685	102,400	295,370	23,319,871	23,615,241
1905.....	31,190	107,520	3,580	125,755	289,850	23,915,690	24,205,540
1906.....	31,140	106,670	2,485	160,120	272,670	27,292,617	27,565,287
1907.....	21,440	91,325	3,655	173,155	289,575	29,156,094	29,445,669
1908.....	19,245	70,165	4,365	190,405	293,180	32,577,922	32,871,102
1909.....	24,305	67,395	160	159,730	251,590	27,075,248	27,326,838
1910.....	13,390	54,450	240	75,410	143,540	31,538,865	31,682,405
1911.....	37,480	62,060	490	201,800	301,830	28,965,658	29,267,488
1912.....	24,060	45,875	910	151,580	222,425	31,108,026	31,330,451
1913.....	27,735	11,275	5,380	166,735	211,125	32,221,676	32,432,801

Total receipts and shipments at St. Louis by rail and by water for years given.

[From reports of the Merchants' Exchange, St. Louis.]

Year.	Total by water.	Total by rail.	Grand total.
	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.
1880.....	1,831,385	8,852,204	10,683,589
1890.....	1,265,592	15,240,141	16,505,733
1900.....	757,590	24,555,750	25,313,340
1905.....	370,425	39,141,663	39,512,088
1910.....	191,965	51,726,135	51,918,100
1911.....	369,295	46,939,995	47,309,290
1912.....	265,720	51,476,639	51,742,359
1913.....	258,709	54,350,851	54,609,560

FOUR MILLION WANTED FOR MORE LAND RECLAMATION.

To show what Missouri and Illinois Members are up against I quote briefly from proceedings of the Upper Mississippi Drainage Association as reported in the Globe Democrat of November 9 last:

The chief topic under discussion was a plan to obtain Government aid in completing levees between Rock Island and Cairo. This can be done, according to statements made at the meeting, with \$4,000,000. It was pointed out that \$60,000,000 has been appropriated by the Government for work south of Cairo and a very small amount for the river north of Cairo. It was decided to ask the next session of Congress to appropriate \$1,000,000 a year for this work.

Sure. But why stop at \$1,000,000 or \$4,000,000, when the lower Mississippi has had more than \$60,000,000 and nearer \$100,000,000 from the Government, largely for land reclamation? Why not demand that for every dollar spent on the lower river reclamation work and every dollar spent on the Missouri River reclamation work an equal amount should be spent on the upper river? In short, why not throw open the Federal Treasury doors and take over every land reclamation and private water-power project in the country? If one gets a grab, why not all? Incidentally, this is the 780,000-acre reclamation project covered by the resolution just offered.

IS NOT COL. TOWNSEND'S JUDGMENT SOUND?—IT CALLS A HALT ON 58 RIVER PROJECTS. WHY NOT?

Again, I quote from Col. Townsend's remarkable address before the river and harbor lobby, which was extended in the Record of December 11, 1915. Therein he says:

Specifically the writer would not abandon any navigable stream in the Mississippi Valley that has been partially improved, but would leave 58 of them in their status quo, confining operations to snagging and the maintenance of existing works, and would concentrate appropriations on opening up a channel of the capacity of that existing on the lower and middle Mississippi to Chicago and Pittsburgh.

If the facilities thus afforded by the Government are utilized, the upper Mississippi and the Missouri Rivers should then receive attention.

Col. Townsend calls a halt on the upper Mississippi and the Missouri River improvements until the \$100,000,000 Ohio and \$275,000,000 lower Mississippi projects are finished; and if these streams are ever utilized (?), then go on with the remaining 58 projects, including the Missouri and upper Mississippi. He is amply sustained in his demand for a halt on the 58 projects, but our rivers will not be "utilized" for reasons hereinbefore set forth.

ANOTHER SPECIFIC INDICTMENT—SILVER STIMULANTS FOR THE
MISSISSIPPI NEAR ST. LOUIS.

About \$17,223,000 of Government funds have been dumped into the 200-mile stretch of the Mississippi, reaching from the mouth of the Missouri to the mouth of the Ohio. After spending over \$86,000 per mile on this part of the river, Senator Burton, the greatest waterway authority in the country, says we had spent more money on this 200 miles of river than the Prussian Government had spent on the entire length of the River Rhine during all the centuries that have passed. Traffic on the Rhine ordinarily reaches 45,000,000 tons annually; or many hundred times the traffic reported on this 200 miles of the Mississippi. Yet the Chief of Engineers gave \$300,000 on April 1, 1915, in addition to \$297,260 balance on hand, or about \$3,000 per mile in 1915 to keep dredgers busy on this notoriously wasteful project, and this bill calls for \$350,000 more for that 200 miles of river.

From an unexpected source Senator Burton is corroborated in his statement of monumental waste along this part of the river. All the faith of waterway lobbyists and river enthusiasts in recent years has been pinned to J. H. Bernhard, the boat builder, who once predicted a rejuvenation of river traffic. Every citizen devoutly hopes Bernhard's prophecy will be realized, but in a discussion by Mr. Bernhard, found in the proceedings of the American Society of Engineers for 1915, occurs this remarkable statement, that is respectfully dedicated to the horn of plenty controlled by Chief Kingman:

To-day the Mississippi from St. Louis to its mouth affords a channel which is the best to be found in any stream in the world. * * * and see its emptiness. An 8-foot channel is all that the most efficient service requires. The Government works unremittently to develop waterways only to see the water-borne traffic grow less as the years go by. Still the average "river man" will insist the poor condition of the channels keeps our inland waters idle. This is preposterous; the Rhine could never compare with the Mississippi in its advantages for transportation; its channel is narrower and shallower, more changeable, the current is swifter, and ice is known in the winter over its entire navigable length, yet in 1913 more than 97,000 vessels passed the Dutch and German frontier on the Rhine.

Here is the opinion of Bernhard, the man who once ran a barge to St. Paul and then threw up the sponge. Every authority that deals in facts and not rainbow chasing reaches the same conclusions. What have we secured for \$130,000,000 in round numbers in these three stretches of the river, and how are we to unload a Sinbad burden that grows like Jack's beanstalk? "Criminal waste" is the only proper term to describe a condition of affairs which the public is supporting by direct taxes and through the recommendations of engineers. The Government ought not to contribute more than a nominal amount for maintenance of this river, according to the opinion of Col. Townsend, until we ascertain whether or not any of these improved inland waterways will be used by the public.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mississippi River from the mouth of the Ohio River to and including the mouth of the Missouri River: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$350,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FEAR] has associated me with his opposition to the Mississippi River item. I recall having taken some steps with respect to the flood-control bill, because at the time the flood-control bill came in a provision had already been made for the Mississippi River in the rivers and harbors appropriation bill, and my criticism at the time was based largely upon the fact that we were taking away from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors a very important branch of its work and perhaps preferring one particular part of the river work of the country to others equally deserving and worthy of Government appropriation. I desire to ask the chairman of the Flood Committee at this time as to the status of the flood-control bill.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The bill has been reported by the Senate Commerce Committee without amendment, and, in view of the fact that the prayers of the righteous availeth much and in view of the further fact that, being righteous, I am continuously prayerful for the passage of the bill, I think the chances for its passage through the Senate are good.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The bill carries \$45,000,000, if I recall it correctly, for the Mississippi?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. An authorization of \$45,000,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes; with a view of completing the work?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Completing the levee work. There will be about \$30,000,000 for levees, \$15,000,000 for revetment, and that will be supplemented by not less than \$15,000,000

contributed by local interests toward levee construction, and that will complete the levees.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. When the flood-control bill was before the House gentlemen interested in the Mississippi, of course, did not relinquish their claims upon the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, but sought the appropriations in the usual way last year. They have done the same this year, since the flood-control bill is still pending in the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The flood-control bill, as the gentleman will recall, put the Mississippi and the Sacramento Rivers under continuing contracts.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I understand the purpose of the flood-control bill, but we have made two appropriations in the river and harbor bill for work upon the Mississippi since the Flood Control Committee was established.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. No; the river and harbor bill passed last year before the flood-control bill did.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Flood Control Committee, who, as I have said before, is entitled to most of the credit for the establishment of that committee, having attempted to segregate the Mississippi improvement from other river work in the country, is hopeful that the bill will pass in the Senate. He is wise enough still to come under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors for such annual appropriations as may be necessary to continue the work.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. If the gentleman will permit me—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. So it seems to me it may be a fair question—because I am not opposing the improvement of the Mississippi; I think it ought to be improved—to inquire whether the \$45,000,000 contemplated in the flood-control bill might be reduced by the amount of appropriations that are being made through the Rivers and Harbors Committee in the rivers and harbors bill?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Undoubtedly, I believe that will be done. If the gentleman understands, the flood-control bill is not an appropriation bill—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I understand.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. But it simply authorizes a certain amount of money to be expended, and the appropriation, if the bill had been finally passed, would have been carried in the sundry civil bill. As it is, it is carried in the rivers and harbors bill, but I assume if the bill does pass the Senate, that next year the amount which is estimated will be carried in the sundry civil bill and certainly if this \$6,000,000 bill should become a law I assume that the \$45,000,000 would be reduced that much.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent for one more minute to finish the question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania for one minute? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I take it the Flood Control Committee will adhere to its desire to obtain \$45,000,000 for completion, notwithstanding there may be a lessening of the amount actually needed for completion, by virtue of the appropriations made in the rivers and harbors bill?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Yes; \$45,000,000 is the estimate, and we hope it will pass just exactly as it passed the House and as it has been reported now in the Senate.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will.

Mr. FESS. Are we to understand, then, that if the flood-control bill passes these items will not be in the next bill?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That was my understanding of the statement made by the chairman of the Flood Control Committee when the bill was up, and which he now repeats, that just as soon as the Flood Control Committee is in funds or has the authorization, then requests on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors will cease.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Undoubtedly; and that would then go on the sundry civil bill.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Is it not a fact that this appropriation is for the same purpose as the flood control?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. There is no difference in the world.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Then the gentleman is kind of getting a double crack—

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Oh, the gentleman does not understand it. The same kind of improvements that are being carried out under the rivers and harbors bill will be continued under the flood-control bill if it passes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The flood-control bill, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois, carries only an authorization for an appropriation.

Mr. GALLAGHER. That is true; but the money will be provided, and if the bill passes these items cover the same purposes.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Undoubtedly.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the gentleman from Mississippi to let us have this clear here at this time, so nobody will misunderstand it in future. If the flood-control bill does not pass the Senate, the bill is going to come up the next time, and we are going to thrash this all out again. Now, if I understand the proposition, if the flood-control bill passes and this bill passes, then the appropriation made to the Flood Control Committee will be \$6,000,000 less than it otherwise would be?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Undoubtedly.

Mr. MEEKER. It is not the intention to duplicate this appropriation?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Oh, no; not at all.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will say it is intended, if the flood-control bill passes in time, that this will be reduced by six millions, is it not?

Mr. GALLAGHER. It is intended, if this bill passes and the flood bill is defeated in the Senate, that the work will go on?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. This work would go on, of course. But if the flood bill would pass in the Senate, this would be just \$6,000,000 toward that appropriation that is authorized. It would not be duplicated.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mississippi River from the mouth of the Missouri River to Minneapolis, Minn.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$1,200,000.

[Mr. SMITH of Minnesota addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I suppose this may be called my project. It flows along the border of the State past some of the counties in my district. The engineers recommended \$2,000,000 for improvement this year. Before the committee—and I do not think there will be any objection to my stating this fact—when asked my judgment, I said that it ought to be cut in two, if not more than that. It was placed at \$1,200,000 on the advice of the chairman without objection, and that is what appears in the bill.

I have been advised, Mr. Chairman, at different times that I knew little about the river that I have lived on all my life and have been on a great many miles practically every year. So I was interested last summer in taking a trip down the Mississippi River for the purpose of renewing old acquaintance. We left St. Paul, which, as well as Minneapolis, can send all of the commerce of that great city by water if she chooses, but does not, and we went on the largest boat on the river, the *St. Paul*, down to St. Louis.

In my extended remarks, which I intend to include here, I will relate some incidents to those who care to examine those remarks, of the opinions of rivermen and the captain of the boat, one of the best captains in the country, Capt. Day, of the largest boat on the river, the *St. Paul*.

We had an abundance of water. You will remember that for only three months in the year they have navigation for these boats. This boat made seven round trips last year, supported largely by excursion business.

Briefly, the first boat we passed was about 300 miles south of St. Paul, which met us carrying any commerce—a small tow-boat—with a barge loaded with sand.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. I do not wish to be interrupted until I make this statement and then I will yield. We went down to Keokuk without any trouble from the stage of water. We passed two or three boats of the line carrying excursionists and we had 100 passengers. At Keokuk we dropped 30 feet in the locks. In the statement that I will print I will show the trouble that we found with wing dams and conditions which Capt. Day said made the river far worse than before a single dollar had been spent on the river. We have appropriated \$28,000,000 for this river. How it has been wasted. We went on down below Keokuk and there we were stuck 17 hours at three different points on the river. Why? Because the Keokuk Dam to-day obstructs the river by holding back the water for a 30-foot head. Notwithstanding the St. Croix and the Rock River and Wisconsin, all great rivers flowed into the Mississippi after

we left St. Paul, yet after we got below Keokuk Dam the navigation was worse than at any other place.

I heard the Chief of Engineers say before our committee the other day that below Rock Island the river is in splendid condition. I not only take issue with him, but present the best authority that can be found in the country, better than that of the Chief of Engineers, and I desire to read it. That may be a pretty large statement, but I think I will convince the House that the statement is true.

Now, I will read from a letter from the Streckfus Co., of St. Louis, the largest and practically only boat line on the upper river. I have the letter, which was sent to me with two petitions. I received the petitions after having told them to take the matter up with their local Representatives. I shall read a part of both, but I will print it all. It was dated St. Louis, September 21, 1916, and was sent to me. I did not ask for this, but am glad to present it, for it tells a tragic tale of inefficiency and worse:

To the honorable Members of Congress of the States of Mississippi and Illinois (on and along the Mississippi River, from St. Louis, Mo., north), Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: We, the undersigned steamboat men, have tried hard to make river navigation and transportation upon the Mississippi River north of St. Louis, Mo., a success, but it seems without avail.

Your Mr. A. E. Richards, assistant United States engineer, stationed at Hannibal, Mo., is, in our opinion, thoroughly incompetent and unreliable. He is apt and willing to cover up things he has failed to do, etc., but to actually aid us, one and all, he positively is the limit.

We respectfully ask for his transfer, for this river and for the betterment of the service; his resignation, however, would be preferable.

They go on to say—

We need action and attention on the Mississippi River during the early months of the year; not wait until September and October when most all river traffic ceased.

This is signed by 12 pilots and 5 steamboat men from the Streckfus Steamboat Co. and other companies.

A second petition is also submitted, sent in the same way. This says—

We, the undersigned steamboat men, find the lighthouse service upon the Mississippi River, from St. Louis north, in a very bad, unsafe, and unsatisfactory condition.

Only by reading the extended statement which I have prepared can you understand fully what some of these difficulties are, which have not been obviated but which have been made greater by these so-called improvements that exist on the Mississippi River. The petition goes on to say—

We need more buoys, markings, lights, etc., and the attention given the river is inadequate and inexcusable. In fact, it is deplorable, dangerous, and steamers grounding daily.

Understand, they have over 4½ feet above the Keokuk Dam, but below the dam the power company controls all agencies. It has destroyed any possibility of navigation. The petition proceeds—

We ask that you proceed and have the lighthouse system on the Mississippi River north of Missouri River taken out of the United States Engineering Department (Maj. Hoffman at Rock Island, Ill.) and placed back in the lighthouse department (where it formerly was), and furnish a lighthouse tender to do nothing else but attend to the lights and lighthouse duty, attending to the same at all times and not lie up on shore most of the time.

This needs immediate attention and continual attention; not a few spurts now and then, but all the time, all the year navigation is on, and we want daily or trip reports of same. We have not gotten a report of soundings and changes of channel, etc., for at least two years past. We want them and need them positively, the same as is furnished river men from St. Louis down by the Lighthouse Service steamer.

This is signed by a long list of pilots and a long list of steamboat men; practically all the men on the upper Mississippi River have signed. It was sent voluntarily by them, and is presented to the House in my extended remarks, which I will print here in to-day's Record.

Mr. Chairman, we have spent about \$28,000,000 on the upper river, and according to the statement of one of the oldest and most experienced captains on the river, running the largest boat on the river, the *St. Paul*, the river is not in as good condition as it was before a dollar of money was expended. He says before those dams were placed there he could carry a large traffic; that then they had 6 feet practically the whole way, and now, during the short navigation season, they have less than 3½ feet below the Keokuk dam, where we grounded on several occasions. That is the situation that has resulted after an investment of \$28,000,000 in the upper river. On the entire river the Government has invested \$159,000,000, and during that time the once large commerce of the river has disappeared. Even now the men who run on the upper river receive no protection from the Government. A power plant owns navigation for which we have paid \$28,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota for a question.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Is the gentleman surprised, in the face of those facts, that the traffic on the river has declined?

Mr. FREAR. The boats under favorable conditions could not compete with the railroads, because the people will not send freight by these boats. That will be more fully covered in my extended remarks. Mr. Bernhard went to St. Paul with his barge and they greeted him with bouquets and with a banquet, but when it came to tonnage there was no promise from the men above, because they wanted better, quicker service, which they got from the railroads. I am confident that the only way you can get commerce back on the river to any extent is by making minimum rates in favor of boat traffic that will prevent railroads from driving the boats off the river. This boat line, the largest on the river, which runs only three months in the year, is maintained almost entirely by passenger business and not by the freight business, because there is practically no freight carried. On the boat on which I went down there were not 20 tons of freight, and it is a 1,200-ton boat. Outside of the passengers and baggage there were not 20 tons of freight.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FREAR. My time has expired, I am sorry to say.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in agreement with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR]. Conditions on the upper Mississippi River, so far as the obstructions caused by the Keokuk Dam are concerned, are exactly as the gentleman from Wisconsin has described them. In fact, he has not told the story as bad as it really is.

Ten or twelve years ago we gave to the Mississippi River Development Co. the right to dam the Mississippi River, and the franchise we gave them is not limited by its terms. They constructed at Keokuk, on the river, a great dam, representing to those in England and in Canada and in this country, whom they induced to invest in the stock, that it was possible to develop there over 200,000 horsepower of electrical energy. Upon that statement, absolutely false, they financed this enterprise. I have in my possession a letter from the engineers, dated not long ago, advising me that 75,000 horsepower was as much as they could develop at that point on the river without impounding the water. By impounding the water there in the nighttime, and that is permitted by the Secretary of War and by the engineers, they are able to develop there horsepower somewhat larger than 75,000, but not nearly as large as the amount they represented they could develop. They market most of this in the city of St. Louis. They control the distributing companies in St. Louis and the public-service corporations and the distributing companies at the present time throughout Illinois, and no living man has been benefited by the building of this dam across that river. The property is now part of the rapidly developing Water Power Trust in this country, and the dam is an obstruction to navigation and river steamers do ground below the dam. That is made possible by the fact that the engineers or the Secretary of War, or both of them, have issued permits to the company now owning the structure across the river to actually impound in the nighttime the water which flows in the Mississippi River.

I had a hearing before the Committee on Rules some time ago and made a record of the existing evidence, and it shows that these permits are granted, and that as a result of that vessels run aground below the dam. I know of no reason why we should expend millions and millions of dollars upon the upper Mississippi River and then permit a private corporation to dam it up, and then permit executive officers of this Government to authorize that company to stop the natural flow of the water in the Mississippi River and hold it back of their dam in the nighttime. I now offer to amend this section by inserting, after the figures "\$1,200,000," in line 11, page 32, the following language:

Permits shall not be granted by the Secretary of War or the Chief of Engineers, or either of them, allowing the impounding of waters above any dam in the Mississippi River.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 32, by inserting, at the end of line 11, the following: "Permits shall not be granted by the Secretary of War or the Chief of Engineers, or either of them, allowing the impounding of waters above any dam in the Mississippi River."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve a point of order. I did not know that the gentleman was going to offer an amendment, or else I would have followed more closely the speech that he made concerning the navigability of this stream and the difficulty encountered by the construction of the Keokuk

Dam. I am not sufficiently advised to allow this amendment to go through without some further elucidation of the subject. The amendment is clearly not within the province of this committee to report. The jurisdiction of matters pertaining to dams on navigable streams is with the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I will ask the gentleman who proposes the amendment whether the matter has ever been considered* by that or any other committee, or whether it is just merely the opinion of the gentleman framed to meet the conditions as he believes them to be?

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I have stated the conditions as I know them to be. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] will corroborate me in what I have said.

Mr. FREAR. I gave the statement of all of the pilots and steamboat men on the upper river to that effect.

Mr. STAFFORD. Unfortunately I was out of the Chamber when the gentleman from Wisconsin was discussing this item, and for a part of the time while the gentleman from Illinois was discussing it.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that the dam as operated by the company now operating it is a real obstruction to navigation in the Mississippi River. The company is permitted by the engineers and by the Secretary of War to close its gates in the nighttime to prevent the water from flowing over the dam and down the river, so as to impound the water back of the dam in order that during the remainder of the hours of the 24 they can generate hydroelectric energy in a quantity sufficiently large to yield the returns the company, operating and owning that dam think they ought to have.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has this proposal ever been submitted for investigation to the War Department or to any bureau or branch of that department?

Mr. RAINEY. I will say that I have called the attention of the War Department to it frequently.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has there been any formal investigation or hearing upon the subject?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes; there was a hearing before the Committee on Rules in the House on a resolution which I introduced myself. The hearing was had about a year ago.

Mr. STAFFORD. There has been no investigation of its merits by any committee of the House?

Mr. RAINEY. No; I do not know that such an investigation has been had.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I think the matter is too important to incorporate in the rivers and harbors bill that will affect the rights—I do not know how extensively—of some large hydro company. It may be the users of hydroelectric power. I do not think that it is good legislation to put on this bill an amendment of this character—

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. STAFFORD (continuing). Without further investigation by some duly constituted authority of Congress or of the War Department. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. DYER. My understanding is that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce sent a subcommittee there for the making of certain investigations; what it was or what their report is I do not know, but I do not think they have made any report. I do not think myself the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois ought to be permitted at this time without more complete information, and I should myself insist upon the point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. The statement of the gentleman from Missouri confirms the position I was about to take, and I make the point of order.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss the point of order.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, suppose I make this request: That this matter go over until we have reached the end of the bill and then we can return to it and probably in the meantime we can thrash out something that might meet the situation. I want to say that I myself would be a little afraid that we might do unintentionally an injustice if we adopted this amendment. I do not know that any investigation has been made, certainly the engineers have made none as the result of any action taken by Congress on the subject, and I think if we are going to do anything at all some provision looking to an investigation by the engineers would be better than to legislate now in the dark.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that this paragraph and amendment may be passed over with the point of order pending until the close of the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the request.

Mr. RAINEY. I have no objection to the request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the public-buildings bill that passed the other day, and I desire to insert in connection therewith a couple of editorials from the New York Sun.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. The paragraph has been passed over, with the point of order pending.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Then I will not make the request.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mississippi River between Brainerd and Grand Rapids, Minn.: For maintenance, \$2,000.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the proposition advanced on this floor a few moments ago that this House create a commission which would divest this House of authority to control the expenditure of appropriations under a rivers and harbors bill. In other words, as I understand it, we are to appropriate a lump sum which we leave entirely to the War Department or a commission created by this Congress, and that this commission would have entire charge of all sums of money appropriated by Congress to be spent in its wisdom.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAGSDALE. In just a moment.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. I was going to say the gentleman misunderstood the proposition I made. There is no such proposition as that. It was simply that a commission should take charge of the water resources of this country, of course operating under the direction of Congress.

Mr. RAGSDALE. That we would vest them with authority to go ahead and in their time spend sums of money and make recommendations. If this Congress would find the same condition of affairs existing under the expenditures of the sums of money that would place in their power, if this Congress would find the same condition of affairs existing in the handling of the powers that we would give them that we find to-day in the War Department in the handling of our troops on the border, I want to say for one that I am unqualifiedly opposed to it, and I hope I shall never see any such legislation enacted. Answering the call of the President of the United States, with the approval of the Secretary of War, we gave authority to that department to take charge of the boys that came to the colors, and they were sent to the border.

We understand that in the handling of these troops on the border there would be no discrimination. I understood they were to be recalled from the border with regard to the longevity of their service, and yet, Mr. Chairman, I find that in my own State there has been the grossest discrimination against the boys from our State, to the extent that I feel that I could not properly represent the people of my part of the State if I did not come on the floor of this House and protest against the outrageous treatment that has been accorded them by the Secretary of War. He seeks to excuse himself from this only on the ground that he has divested himself of the authority and put it in control of Gen. Funston on the border. Why, Mr. Chairman, when we empower the Secretary of War to take charge of our men on the border he can not excuse himself by saying that he has delegated that authority to anyone. I have been there in person. I have received letters and telegrams from widows and from people at home who needed their boys there. It is true that we have had remarkably few deaths among the men that have gone from my State, but, Mr. Chairman, when I go to the War Department and ask for information as to the time that these men will be brought back, I am met only with the information that they have no idea, but that I must go to Funston. Why, it is a most remarkable procedure that Members of Congress coming here clothed with the powers that we have, have to go to the War Department and ask for the simplest bits of

information affecting the men that we now have on the border and are referred to a man a thousand miles away.

Where can we get the information that we are to give to our people? We get it from nowhere. Has it been right, this treatment of our boys? Take the letter I have just received and which I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD. Take the report given me here by the Secretary of War, which shows on the face the grossest injustice in dealing with these men. Here are States, among them the State of Rhode Island, every single troop of which has been brought home. Why are our troops still there, that have been there within a few days of the same period of time that the others have served, troops that have been home for 90 days and that were not 90 days in the service on the border? And yet, what are we told to-day as to the reason why they should stay there?

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAGSDALE. Yes.

Mr. NORTON. May not this be the reason, namely, that the troops from your State are kept down there, so that they may require more drill?

Mr. RAGSDALE. Oh, yes; that may be the reason, and it may be the reason that because the troops of your State were incapable of good service, and they needed good troops, that mine are kept there. We will take the record of South Carolina, and the flag has never yet suffered at her hands. I will not discuss with the gentleman the troops of his State, because I want to stay on friendly terms with him. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, no man ever yet came here and tried to be smart or funny at the expense of the bravery of the men from South Carolina. No brave man, who knows their record and knows the history of that State, would ever question it. In all of history, all of the glory, of this country, on every field of battle, whenever called upon to do yeomen service, they have never faltered, and in a way the gentleman has never yet done, as far as I know, and their record speaks against any such insinuation as he would make against them. When he has gone to the front himself, when he has done anything that would make him worthy of holding this flag aloft, then let him come here and impugn the integrity and bravery of the State I represent, but until then please do not ask me for further time.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAGSDALE. No, Mr. Chairman; I will not yield further to a man who wants to ask that question.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. RAGSDALE. Why, certainly. [Laughter.]

Mr. FESS. The Secretary of War comes from my State—

Mr. RAGSDALE. Yes, sir.

Mr. FESS. All the troops went down at one time from Ohio.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Yes, sir.

Mr. FESS. And part of them have been released and part of them have met with what you call a discrimination.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I am not here to represent the State of Ohio. The gentleman does it so well that I would not wish to succeed him. I am here to take care of the people of my State, and I say that in the handling of the troops from the different States of the Union and the handling of the troops from my State there is shown an unfair and unpardonable discrimination.

If the Secretary of War, if Maj. Gen. Funston, will give to this Congress or to me, as a Representative of that people, any legitimate excuse that justifies their retention on the border for a period of time beyond that of other troops, and the reason for the discrimination between them and other troops, I will not say a word. But when I go to him as the Secretary of War, when I go to the proper authority, as I conceive it here, in the War Department, and I am referred to Maj. Gen. Funston as to the time they will come back, then it seems to me I have a right to protest.

There is no war on the border to-day. I understand that there is some little trouble over in Mexico, but I understand we are withdrawing all of our troops from Mexico.

If, therefore, our troops are no longer needed in Mexico; if the war, whatever it may have been in Mexico, so far as we are concerned, is at an end; if the time has come when all the other troops can leave there, has not the time arrived when all the Federal soldiers, the Regular Army, down there can defend themselves from the puny little band of Villa, and these men allowed to return to civil life, where they belong? [Applause.]

I have no desire to interfere with the operations of the War Department. I have no desire to do anything that would reflect in any way upon the attitude that this Government should take in its foreign relations. But I do say that one of two things ought to occur—we either ought to use the troops that we have on that border or, as far as they have been drawn from civil life, when they have served for the period of time that those men have served there by way of comparison with other

troops they ought to be allowed to return home; and I would like to know from the War Department why it is not permitted to them. [Applause.]

The letter referred to is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 24, 1917.

Hon. J. WILLARD RAGSDALE,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. RAGSDALE: Referring to your request over the telephone on yesterday afternoon for a statement showing the dates of arrival on the Mexican border of organizations of the National Guard and the dates of departure therefrom of such organizations for home stations for muster out, I beg leave to inform you that no official statement setting forth the information that you are seeking has ever been issued by the department. However, there is inclosed herewith a copy of a schedule which has been prepared for use within the department

only, which sets forth the information sought by you. It is presumed that the schedule is substantially correct, but still I would not like to have it used in a public way or given out for publication as an official document.

With reference to the selection of National Guard units to be sent home for muster out, it may be stated that the general rule under which the commanding general, Southern Department, has operated has been to return such units in the order of their dates of arrival on the border. Other considerations, such as the tactical situation surrounding border service and the necessity for a gradual reduction at critical points on the border, which would not involve the entire depletion in any one section, have at times required a modification of the general rule mentioned above.

Trusting that the inclosed unofficial schedule may serve your purpose fully, I remain,

Sincerely, yours,

NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War.

(One inclosure.)

History of movements of National Guard organizations called into the service of the United States under dates of May 9 and June 18, 1916.
[Corrected to include Jan. 24, 1917. Italic notations indicate corrections and dates obtained from various sources.]

State.	Organization.	Date of departure from mobilization camp.	Date of arrival on border.	Date of departure from border.	Date of arrival at home station.	Date of muster out.
Alabama (Montgomery).....	First brigade headquarters.....	Oct. 24, 1916	Oct. 28, 1916			
	First Infantry.....	Oct. 20, 1916	Oct. 24, 1916			
	Second Infantry.....	Oct. 18, 1916	Oct. 22, 1916			
	Fourth Infantry.....	Oct. 23, 1916	Oct. 27, 1916			
	(Battery A, Field Artillery.....	Oct. 4, 1916	Oct. 8, 1916			
Ordered home Jan. 22, 1917.....	Battery C, Field Artillery.....	do.	do.			
	First Company Signal Corps.....	Oct. 24, 1916	Oct. 28, 1916			
	Ambulance Company No. 1.....	do.	do.			
	Field Hospital Company No. 1.....	do.	do.			
Arizona.....	First Cavalry.....	Dec. 9, 1916	Dec. 12, 1916			
Arkansas ordered home.....	First Infantry.....	June 19, 1916	June 19, 1916			
	First Infantry.....	Aug. 10, 1916	Aug. 13, 1916			
	Second Infantry.....	do.	do.			
California (State Fair Grounds, Sacramento).	First Brigade Infantry.....	July 4, 1916	July 6, 1916	Oct. 18, 1916	Oct. 20, 1916	Nov. 6, 1916
	Second Infantry.....	June 30, 1916	July 3, 1916	Oct. 22, 1916	Oct. 25, 1916	Nov. 15, 1916
	Fifth Infantry.....	July 3, 1916	July 5, 1916	Sept. 1, 1916	Sept. 4, 1916	Oct. 7, 1916
	Seventh Infantry.....	do.	July 6, 1916	Oct. 18, 1916	Oct. 20, 1916	Nov. 11, 1916
	First Squadron Cavalry.....	June 29, 1916	July 2, 1916	Oct. 26, 1916	Oct. 28, 1916	Nov. 17, 1916
	First Battalion Field Artillery.....	June 30, 1916	July 3, 1916	Battalion headquarters and Battery B, Dec. 13, 1916.	Dec. 15, 1916	Battalion headquarters Battery B, Dec. 21, 1916.
				Battery A, Dec. 20, 1916	Dec. 22, 1916	Dec. 30, 1916
				Battery C, Dec. 21, 1916	Dec. 23, 1916	Jan. 6, 1917
	Company B, Signal Corps.....	July 4, 1916	July 6, 1916	Oct. 19, 1916	Oct. 21, 1916	Nov. 6, 1916
	Ambulance Company No. 1.....	do.	do.	Oct. 14, 1916	Oct. 16, 1916	Oct. 31, 1916
	Field Hospital No. 1.....	do.	do.	do.	do.	Do.
Colorado.....	Company A, Engineers.....	Oct. 1, 1916	Oct. 5, 1916			
	First Battalion Infantry.....	Oct. 13, 1916	Oct. 16, 1916			
	Second Battalion Infantry.....	do.	do.			
	First Squadron Cavalry.....	Oct. 11, 1916	do.			
	Battalion Headquarters Field Artillery.....	Sept. 30, 1916	Oct. 3, 1916			
	Battery B, Field Artillery.....	do.	do.			
	Battery C, Field Artillery.....	do.	do.			
	Company A, Signal Corps.....	Oct. 12, 1916	Oct. 14, 1916			
	Field Hospital No. 1.....	do.	Oct. 15, 1916			
Connecticut (Niantic).....	First Infantry.....	June 27, 1916	July 4, 1916	Oct. 5, 1916	Oct. 12, 1916	Oct. 30, 1916
	Second Infantry.....	do.	July 4, 1916	Oct. 17, 1916	Oct. 26, 1916	Nov. 8, 9, 11, 14, 1916.
	Troop A, Cavalry.....	June 29, 1916	July 7, 1916	Oct. 14, 1916	Oct. 22, 1916	Nov. 4, 1916
	Troop B, Cavalry.....	June 27, 1916	July 6, 1916	Oct. 13, 1916	Oct. 21, 1916	Oct. 28, 1916
	Battery E, 10 Field Artillery.....	Oct. 1, 1916	Oct. 5, 1916			
	Battery F, 10 Field Artillery.....	do.	do.			
	First Field Company, Signal Corps.....	June 27, 1916	July 6, 1916	Oct. 13, 1916	Oct. 21, 1916	Do.
	Ambulance Company No. 1.....	June 27, 1916	July 6, 1916	Oct. 14, 1916	Oct. 16, 1916	Do.
	Field Hospital No. 1.....	do.	do.	do.	Oct. 22, 1916	Nov. 8, 1916
Delaware ordered home for muster out.....	First Battalion Infantry.....	July 25, 1916	July 30, 1916			
District of Columbia (Fort Myer, Va.).....	Second Battalion Infantry.....	do.	do.			
	Third Infantry.....	Oct. 4, 1916	Oct. 9, 1916			
	First Separate Battalion.....	July 4, 1916	July 9, 1916	Oct. 8, 1916	Oct. 15, 1916	Oct. 23, 1916
	Troop A, Cavalry.....	Oct. 2, 1916	Oct. 6, 1916			
	Battery A, Field Artillery.....	do.	Oct. 7, 1916			
Ordered home for muster out.....	Battery B, Field Artillery.....	Aug. 7, 1916	Aug. 13, 1916			
	Company A, Signal Corps.....	July 4, 1916	July 9, 1916	Dec. 13, 1916	Dec. 20, 1916	Dec. 27, 1916
	Field Hospital No. 1.....	do.	do.	Oct. 17, 1916	Oct. 23, 1916	Oct. 28, 1916
Florida.....	Second Infantry.....	Oct. 2, 1916	Oct. 6, 1916			
	Field Hospital No. 1.....	Oct. 18, 1916	Oct. 21, 1916			
Georgia (Macon).....	First Brigade Headquarters.....	Oct. 23, 1916	Oct. 28, 1916			
	First Infantry.....	Oct. 24, 1916	Oct. 27, 1916			
	Second Infantry.....	Oct. 22, 1916	Oct. 27, 1916			
	Fifth Infantry.....	Oct. 23, 1916	Oct. 28, 1916			
	Second Squadron Cavalry.....	Oct. 25, 1916	Oct. 29, 1916			
	Troop A, Cavalry.....	do.	do.			
	First Battalion, Field Artillery.....	Oct. 3, 1916	Oct. 7, 1916			
	Field Hospital No. 1.....	Oct. 25, 1916	Oct. 29, 1916			
	Second Infantry.....	July 7, 1916	July 11, 1916	Dec. 19, 1916	Dec. 23, 1916	
Idaho.....	First Brigade Headquarters.....	June 30, 1916	July 2, 1916	Sept. 1, 1916	Sept. 4, 1916	Oct. 5, 1916
Illinois (Springfield).....	Second Brigade Headquarters.....	July 2, 1916	July 3, 1916			
Ordered home.....	First Infantry.....	June 28, 1916	July 1, 1916	Sept. 1, 1916, less Supply Company, which departed Oct. 18, 1916.	Sept. 3, 1916	Oct. 4, 1916
				Sept. 4, 1916, less Supply Company, which departed Oct. 18, 1916.	Oct. 21, 1916	Nov. 5, 1916
	Second Infantry.....	June 29, 1916	July 2, 1916	Sept. 7, 1916	Sept. 7, 1916	Oct. 5, 1916
				Oct. 21, 1916		Nov. 5, 1916

History of movements of National Guard organizations called into the service of the United States, etc.—Continued.

State.	Organization.	Date of departure from mobilization camp.	Date of arrival on border.	Date of departure from border.	Date of arrival at home station.	Date of muster out.
Illinois (Springfield) ordered home for muster out.	Third Infantry	July 2, 1916	July 5, 1916			
	Fourth Infantry	July 1, 1916	July 6, 1916			
	Seventh Infantry	June 30, 1916	July 2, 1916	Dec. 29, 1916	Jan. 1, 1917	
	Eighth Infantry	July 4, 1916	July 6, 1916	Oct. 7, 1916	Oct. 11, 1916	Oct. 27, 1916
	First Cavalry	July 1, 1916	July 4, 1916	Oct. 17, 1916	Oct. 23, 1916	Nov. 17, 1916
	First Field Artillery	July 4, 1916	July 7, 1916	Oct. 10, 1916	Oct. 13, 1916	Oct. 31, 1916
	Battery F, First Field Artillery	do	do	Sept. 7, 1916	Sept. 10, 1916	Sept. 25, 1916
	Company A, Engineers	do	do	Oct. 17, 1916	Oct. 20, 1916	Nov. 3, 1916
	Company A, Signal Corps	do	do	Dec. 21, 1916	Dec. 24, 1916	Jan. 5, 1917
	Field Hospital, No. 1	do	do	Oct. 10, 1916	Oct. 12, 1916	Oct. 26, 1916
	Field Hospital, No. 2	do	do	Oct. 17, 1916	Oct. 20, 1916	Nov. 3, 1916
	First Brigade Headquarters	July 10, 1916	July 14, 1916			
	Company I, First Infantry	July 11, 1916	July 15, 1916	Sept. 19, 1916	Sept. 23, 1916	Oct. 2, 1916
	Band, Second Infantry	July 10, 1916	July 16, 1916	Sept. 19, 1916	Sept. 23, 1916	Sept. 26, 1916
Indiana (Fort Benjamin Harrison), ordered home.	Second Infantry	do	do			
	Third Infantry	July 7, 1916	July 11, 1916	Dec. 4, 1916	Dec. 8, 1916	Dec. 29, 1916
	First Battalion, Field Artillery	July 6, 1916	July 10, 1916	Jan. 2, 1917	Jan. 6, 1917	Jan. 19, 1917
	Battery B, Field Artillery	do	do	Sept. 13, 1916	Sept. 16, 1916	Sept. 28, 1916
	Company A, Signal Corps	July 8, 1916	July 11, 1916	Dec. 30, 1916	Jan. 5, 1917	
	Field Hospital No. 1	July 8, 1916	July 11, 1916	do	do	
	Field Hospital No. 2	Dec. 16, 1916	Dec. 19, 1916			
	Ambulance Company No. 1	July 8, 1916	July 11, 1916	Dec. 30, 1916	Jan. 5, 1917	Jan. 12, 1917
	Ambulance Company No. 2	July 12, 1916	July 16, 1916			
	First Brigade Headquarters	July 25, 1916	July 29, 1916			
Iowa (Des Moines) ordered home for muster out.	First Infantry	do	do	Dec. 18, 1916	Dec. 22 and 24, 1916	Jan. 15, 1917
	Second Infantry	July 22, 1916	July 27, 1916			
	Third Infantry	July 21, 1916	July 24, 1916			
	First Squadron, Cavalry	July 23, 1916	July 27, 1916			
	First Battalion, Field Artillery	July 24, 1916	July 28, 1916	Batteries A and B, Dec. 14, 1916, Battalion Headquarters	Dec. 19, 1916	Battalion Headquarters and Battery A, Dec. 24, 1916
	First Battalion Field Artillery	July 24, 1916	July 28, 1916	Bat. C, Dec. 14, 1916	Dec. 19, 1916	Batteries B and C, Dec. 30, 1916
	Company A, Engineers	July 23, 1916	July 27, 1916	Dec. 24, 1916	Dec. 27, 1916	Jan. 13, 1917
	Field Hospital No. 1	July 21, 1916	July 25, 1916			
	Ambulance Company No. 1	July 21, 1916	July 25, 1916			
	Ordered home for muster out					
Kansas (Fort Riley)	First Infantry	July 6 and 7, 1916	July 9, 1916	Oct. 13, 1916	Oct. 15, 1916	Oct. 30, 1916
	Second Infantry	July 1, 1916	July 3, 1916	Oct. 24, 1916	Oct. 26, 1916	Nov. 12, 1916
	Battery A, Field Artillery	July 6, 1916	July 8, 1916	Dec. 11, 1916	Dec. 13, 1916	Dec. 22, 1916
	Company A, Signal Corps	July 6, 1916	July 8, 1916	Jan. 5, 1917	Jan. 5, 1917	Jan. 15, 1917
	Troop A, Cavalry	Sept. 25, 1916	Sept. 28, 1916			
	Medical detachment					
	First Brigade, Headquarters	Aug. 30, 1916	Sept. 4, 1916			
	First Infantry	Aug. 31, 1916	Sept. 4, 1916	Co. A, Jan. 21, 1917		
	Second Infantry	Aug. 30, 1916	Sept. 3, 1916	Co. L, Jan. 21, 1917		
	Third Infantry	Aug. 31, 1916	Sept. 4, 1916	Co. D, Jan. 27, 1917		
Kentucky (Fort Thomas)	Company A, Signal Corps	Aug. 30, 1916	Sept. 3, 1916			
	Field Hospital No. 1	Aug. 30, 1916	Sept. 4, 1916			
	Ambulance Company No. 1	Aug. 30, 1916	Sept. 4, 1916			
	First Infantry	July 20, 1916	July 22, 1916	Sept. 2, 1916	Sept. 4, 1916	Sept. 25, 1916
	Troop A, Cavalry	July 18, 1916	July 20, 1916	Sept. 29, 1916	Oct. 1, 1916	Oct. 6, 1916
	First Battalion Field Artillery	do	do			
	Field Hospital No. 1	Aug. 6, 1916	Aug. 7, 1916			
	Second Infantry	June 29, 1916	July 4, 1916	Oct. 7, 1916	Oct. 14, 1916	Oct. 25, 1916
	First Brigade Headquarters	July 5, 1916	July 10, 1916	Oct. 17, 1916	Oct. 24, 1916	Oct. 30, 1916
	Fourth Infantry	June 30, 1916	July 6, 1916	do	do	Nov. 4, 1916
Louisiana (Alexandria)	Fifth Infantry	July 5, 1916	July 9, 1916	Sept. 1, 1916	Sept. 7, 1916	Sept. 26, 1916
	Ordered home for muster out					
Maine (Augusta)	Troop A, Cavalry	July 5, 1916	July 10, 1916	Dec. 14, 1916	Dec. 19, 1916	Dec. 23, 1916
	Field Hospital No. 1	do	do	Dec. 25, 1916	Dec. 30, 1916	Jan. 6, 1917
	Ambulance Company No. 1	July 5, 1916	do	do	do	Do
	Second Brigade Headquarters	June 27, 1916	July 3, 1916	Oct. 29, 1916	Nov. 6, 1916	Nov. 24, 1916
	Second Infantry	do	July 2, 1916	Oct. 7, 1916	Oct. 15, 1916	Nov. 4, 1916, less Supply Company, mustered out Nov. 10, 1916
	Fifth Infantry	do	July 1, 1916	Oct. 14, 1916	Oct. 21, 1916	Nov. 15, 1916
	Eighth Infantry	do	July 3, 1916	Oct. 29, 1916	Nov. 6, 1916	Nov. 24, 1916
	Ninth Infantry	June 27, 1916	July 1 and 2, 1916	Oct. 31, 1916	Nov. 7, 1916	Nov. 18, 1916
	First Squadron Cavalry	June 28, 1916	July 3, 1916	Nov. 2, 1916	Nov. 9, 1916	Nov. 23, 1916
	First Battalion Field Artillery	do	July 2, 1916	Oct. 10-11, 1916	Oct. 17, 1916	Nov. 18, 1916
Maryland (Laurel)	Second Battalion Field Artillery	do	July 3, 1916	Oct. 25, 1916	Nov. 1, 1916	Nov. 24, 1916
	First Battalion Signal Corps	June 27, 1916	July 2, 1916	Oct. 18, 1916	Oct. 24, 1916	Nov. 11, 1916
	Field Hospital, No. 1	do	do	Sept. 20, 1916	Sept. 26, 1916	Oct. 17, 1916
	Sept. 1, 1916	Sept. 7, 1916	Sept. 7, 1916			
	Ambulance Company No. 1	June 27, 1916	July 1, 1916	Dec. 12, 1916	Dec. 17, 1916	Dec. 28, 1916
	Ambulance Company No. 2	Sept. 1, 1916	Sept. 7, 1916			
	First Brigade headquarters	Oct. 1, 1916	Oct. 5, 1916	Dec. 31, 1916	Jan. 5, 1917	Jan. 16, 1917
	Thirty-first Infantry	July 8, 1916	July 11, 1916	do	do	Jan. 20, 1917
	Thirty-second Infantry	July 14, 1916	July 18, 1916	Jan. 18, 1917		
	Thirty-third Infantry	Oct. 6, 1916	Oct. 11, 1916			
Massachusetts (South Framingham)	Troop A, Cavalry	Oct. 4, 1916	Oct. 9, 1916			
	Troop B, Cavalry	do	do			
	Battery A, Field Artillery	Oct. 1, 1916	Oct. 5, 1916			
	Battery B, Field Artillery	do	do			
	Company A, Engineers	Oct. 4, 1916	Oct. 9, 1916			
	Ordered home for muster out					
	Ordered home for muster out					
	Michigan (Grayling)					
	Under orders, 12/18					

History of movements of National Guard organizations called into the service of the United States, etc.—Continued.

State.	Organization.	Date of departure from mobilization camp.	Date of arrival on border.	Date of departure from border.	Date of arrival at home station.	Date of muster out.
Michigan (Grayling) under orders, 12/18.	Company A, Signal Corps.	Oct. 4, 1916	Oct. 9, 1916			
	Field hospital No. 1.	Oct. 10, 1916	Oct. 14, 1916			
	Ambulance Company No. 1.	do.	do.			
	Ambulance Company No. 2.	do.	do.			
Minnesota (Fort Snelling)	First Brigade Headquarters.				Jan. 11, 1917	Jan. 20, 1917
Ordered home.	First Infantry.	July 12, 1916	July 16, 1916			
	Second Infantry.	July 15, 1916	July 19, 1916	Jan. 4, 1917	Jan. 11, 1917	
	Third Infantry.	July 10, 1916	July 14, 1916	Dec. 2, 1916	Dec. 7, 1916	Dec. 19, 1916
Ordered home for muster out.	Second Battalion, First Field Artillery.	July 19, 1916	July 24, 1916			
	First Battalion, First Field Artillery.	Oct. 1, 1916	Oct. 7, 1916			
	Battery F, First Field Artillery.	July 19, 1916	July 24, 1916	Sept. 13, 1916	Sept. 17, 1916	Sept. 26, 1916
Mississippi (Jackson).	First Infantry.	Oct. 17, 1916	Oct. 19, 1916			
Missouri (Nevada).	First Brigade Headquarters.	July 4, 1916	July 8, 1916	Dec. 28, 1916	Dec. 31, 1916	Dec. 31, 1916
	First Infantry.	June 30, 1916	July 3, 1916	Sept. 1, 1916	Sept. 4, 1916	Sept. 25, 1916
	Second Infantry.	July 5, 1916	July 8, 1916	Dec. 23, 1916	Dec. 31, 1916	Jan. 15, 1917
	Third Infantry.	July 8, 1916	July 12, 1916	Sept. 1, 1916	Sept. 3, 1916	Sept. 26, 1916
Ordered home for muster out.	Fourth Infantry.	July 4, 1916	July 6, 1916			
	Troop B, Cavalry.	July 5, 1916	July 8, 1916	Dec. 26, 1916	Dec. 29, 1916	Jan. 5, 1917
	First Battalion, Field Artillery.	July 1, 1916	July 4, 1916	Dec. 16, 1916	Dec. 17 and 18, 1916	Dec. 21 and 22, 1916
	Battery A, First Field Artillery.	do.	do.	do.	Dec. 18, 1916	Dec. 21, 1916
	Company A, Signal Corps.	do.	do.	Jan. 3, 1917	Jan. 5, 1917	Jan. 15, 1917
	Field Hospital No. 1.	July 2, 1916	July 11, 1916	Dec. 26, 1916	Dec. 29, 1916	Jan. 6, 1917
	Ambulance Company No. 1.	July 6, 1916	July 8, 1916	do.	do.	do.
Montana (Fort Wm. H. Harrison).	Second Infantry.	July 2, 1916	July 6, 1916	Oct. 11, 1916	Oct. 16, 1916	Nov. 3, 1916
Ordered home for muster out.	Troop A, Cavalry.	Aug. 7, 1916	Aug. 10, 1916			
Nebraska (Lincoln).	Fourth Infantry.	July 7, 1916	July 10, 1916	Dec. 27, 1916	Dec. 31, 1916	Jan. 15, 1917
Ordered home for muster out.	Fifth Infantry.	July 9, 1916	July 14, 1916			
	Company A, Signal Corps.	July 7, 1916	July 10, 1916			
	Field Hospital No. 1.	do.	do.			
New Hampshire (Colechester).	Ordered home, First Infantry.	July 16, 1916	July 20, 1916			
	Troop A, Cavalry.	Oct. 17, 1916	Oct. 23, 1916			
	Battery A, Field Artillery.	Oct. 3, 1916	Oct. 9, 1916			
	Company A, Signal Corps.	Oct. 17, 1916	Oct. 22, 1916			
	Field Hospital No. 1.	do.	do.			
New Jersey (Sea Girt).	First Brigade Headquarters.	July 2, 1916	July 9, 1916	Sept. 4, 1916	Sept. 9, 1916	Oct. 2, 1916
	First Infantry.	June 26, 1916	July 2, 1916	do.	do.	Oct. 7-11, 1916
	Fourth Infantry.	July 1, 1916	July 7, 1916	do.	do.	Oct. 12-14, 1916
	Fifth Infantry.	July 1, 1916	July 7, 1916	do.	do.	Nov. 3, 1916
	First Squadron Cavalry.	June 30, 1916	July 4, 1916	Oct. 27, 1916	Nov. 3, 1916	Nov. 14, 1916
	Battery A, Field Artillery.	July 2, 1916	July 9, 1916	Oct. 8, 1916	Oct. 15, 1916	Oct. 21, 1916
	Battery B, Field Artillery.	June 27, 1916	July 3, 1916	Oct. 8, 1916	Oct. 14, 1916	do.
	Battery C, Field Artillery.	June 26, 1916	do.	do.	do.	Oct. 25, 1916
	First Field Company, Signal Corps.	Oct. 1, 1916	Oct. 10, 1916			
	Field Hospital No. 1.	July 1, 1916	July 6, 1916	Oct. 14, 1916	Oct. 22, 1916	Oct. 28, 1916
	Ambulance Company No. 1.	June 27, 1916	July 2, 1916	Oct. 8, 1916	Oct. 14, 1916	Oct. 21, 1916
	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.
New Mexico (Columbus).	First Infantry.	July 14, 1916	July 14, 1916			
	Battery A, Field Artillery.	June 18, 1916	June 18, 1916			
New York (Green Haven, Camp Whitman).	Sixth Division Headquarters.	July 1, 1916	July 6, 1916	Dec. 14, 1916	Dec. 22, 1916	Dec. 23, 1916
Ordered home for muster out.	Sixth Division Supply Train.	Oct. 17, 1916	Oct. 24, 1916			
	First Brigade Headquarters.	July 8, 1916	July 11, 1916			
	Second Brigade Headquarters.	do.	do.	Sept. 5, 1916	Sept. 11, 1916	Sept. 27, 1916
	Third Brigade headquarters.	June 28, 1916	July 8, 1916	Dec. 15, 1916		
	Second Infantry.	July 7, 1916	July 16, 1916	Sept. 21, 1916	Sept. 27-29, 1916	Oct. 7-30, 1916
	Third Infantry.	July 13, 1916	July 21, 1916	Sept. 8, 1916	Sept. 14-15, 1916	Oct. 5, 1916
	Seventh Infantry.	June 27, 1916	July 2, 1916	Nov. 22, 1916	Nov. 28, 1916	Dec. 2, 1916
	Twelfth Infantry.	June 29, 1916	July 5, 1916			
	Fourteenth Infantry.	June 27, 1916	July 2, 1916	Sept. 8, 1916	Sept. 13, 1916	Oct. 11, 1916
	Twenty-third Infantry.	July 4, 1916	July 11, 1916	Jan. 8, 1917	Jan. 9, 1917	Jan. 17, 1917
	Sixty-ninth Infantry.	July 11, 1916	July 17-18, 1916			
Ordered home for muster out.	Seventy-first Infantry.	June 27, 1916	July 2, 1916	Sept. 6, 1916	Sept. 11, 1916	Oct. 6, 1916
	Seventy-fourth Infantry.	July 4, 1916	July 10, 1916			
	First squadron, June 28, 1916.	do.	do.			
	Second squadron, July 6, 1916.	do.	do.			
	Third squadron, July 7, 1916.	do.	do.			
	First Regiment Cavalry.	July 6, 1916	July 13, 1916	Dec. 15, 1916	Dec. 23, 1916	Dec. 28, 1916
	Squadron A, Cavalry.	July 6, 1916	July 13, 1916			
	First Field Artillery.	June 28, 1916	July 5, 1916	Batteries A, B, and C, Oct. 19, 1916	Batteries A, B, and C, Oct. 26, 1916	Batteries A, B, and C, Nov. 4, 1916
	Second Field Artillery.	July 8, 1916	July 14, 15, 16, 1916	Dec. 30, 1916	Jan. 6, 1917	Battery C, Nov. 8, 1916
	Third Field Artillery.	Oct. 3, 1916	Oct. 10, 1916			Headquarters and Batteries D, E, and F, Nov. 15, 1916
	Twenty-second Engineers.	July 12, 1916	July 18, 1916	Dec. 2, 1916	Dec. 10, 1916	Jan. 4, 1917
	First Battalion.	July 12, 1916	July 8, 1916	Oct. 13, 1916	Oct. 21, 1916	Oct. 30, 1916
	Second Battalion.	July 14, 1916	July 22, 1916	Dec. 16, 1916	Dec. 24, 1916	Jan. 4, 1917
	First Battalion, Signal.	July 5, 1916	July 10, 1916	Dec. 13, 1916	Dec. 20, 1916	Dec. 23, 1916
	Field Hospital, No. 1.	June 28, 1916	July 5, 1916	Oct. 14, 1916	Oct. 20, 1916	Oct. 25, 1916
	Field Hospital No. 2.	July 15, 1916	July 21, 1916	Dec. 14, 1916	Dec. 22, 1916	Dec. 27, 1916
	Field Hospital No. 3.	Oct. 15, 1916	Oct. 17, 1916	Jan. 6, 1917	Jan. 10, 1917	Jan. 18, 1917
	Field Hospital No. 4.	Nov. 10, 1916	Nov. 15, 1916			
	Ambulance Company No. 1.	July 10, 1916	July 16, 1916	Oct. 14, 1916	Oct. 19, 1916	Oct. 24, 1916
	Ambulance Company No. 2.	do.	do.	Dec. 14, 1916	Dec. 21, 1916	Dec. 27, 1916
	Ambulance Company No. 3.	June 28, 1916	July 5, 1916	Dec. 28, 1916	Jan. 5, 1917	Jan. 6, 1917
	Ambulance Company No. 4.	July 15, 1916	July 21, 1916			
Ordered home for muster out.	Field Bakery.					

Machine gun company same dates all through.

History of movements of National Guard organizations called into the service of the United States, etc.—Continued.

State.	Organization.	Date of departure from mobilization camp.	Date of arrival on border.	Date of departure from border.	Date of arrival at home station.	Date of muster out.
North Carolina (Camp Glenn, Moorehead City).	First Brigade Headquarters.....	Sept. 25, 1916	Sept. 29, 1916			
<i>Under orders</i>	First Infantry.....	Sept. 25, 1916	do.....			
	Second Infantry.....	Sept. 25, 1916	Sept. 30, 1916			
	Third Infantry.....	Sept. 27, 1916	Oct. 1, 1916			
	Company A, Engineers.....	Oct. 17, 1916	Oct. 21, 1916			
	Company B, Engineers.....	Oct. 17, 1916	do.....			
	Troop A, Cavalry.....	Sept. 23, 1916	Sept. 28, 1916			
	Troop B, Cavalry.....	do.....	do.....			
	Field Hospital No. 1.....	do.....	do.....			
	Ambulance Company No. 1.....	do.....	do.....			
North Dakota (Fort Lincoln), under orders Dec. 8.	First Infantry.....	July 22, 1916	July 26, 1916	Jan. 23, 1917		
Ohio, Columbus.	First Brigade Headquarters.....	Sept. 6, 1916	Sept. 10, 1916			
<i>Under orders</i>	Second Brigade Headquarters.....	Aug. 30, 1916	Sept. 3, 1916			
	Third Infantry.....	Sept. 5, 1916	Sept. 9, 1916			
	Fourth Infantry.....	Sept. 7, 1916	Sept. 11, 1916			
<i>Under orders to return home for muster out.</i>	Fifth Infantry.....	Aug. 30, 1916	Sept. 3, 1916			
	Sixth Infantry.....	Aug. 29, 1916	do.....			
	Eighth Infantry.....	Sept. 6, 1916	Sept. 10, 1916			
<i>Ordered home for muster out</i>	First Squadron Cavalry.....	Aug. 31, 1916	Sept. 4, 1916			
	First Battalion Field Artillery.....	Sept. 1, 1916	Sept. 6, 1916			
	First Battalion Engineers.....	Sept. 2, 1916	Sept. 6, 1916			
	Separate Company D Engineers.....	Sept. 7, 1916	Sept. 12, 1916			
	First Battalion Signal Corps.....	Sept. 3, 1916	Sept. 7, 1916			
	Field Hospital No. 1.....	Sept. 3, 1916	Sept. 7, 1916			
	Field Hospital No. 2.....	Sept. 8, 1916	Sept. 12, 1916			
	Field Hospital No. 3.....	Sept. 1, 1916	Sept. 5, 1916			
	Field Hospital No. 4.....	Sept. 8, 1916	Sept. 12, 1916			
	Ambulance Company No. 1.....	do.....	do.....			
	Ambulance Company No. 2.....	Sept. 1, 1916	Sept. 5, 1916			
Oklahoma (Fort Sill).....	First Infantry.....	July 19, 1916	July 22, 1916			
<i>Ordered home for muster out</i>	Troop A Cavalry.....	do.....	July 21, 1916			
	Troop B Cavalry.....	do.....	do.....			
	Company A Engineers.....	July 19, 1916	do.....			
	Field Hospital, No. 1.....	July 19, 1916	do.....			
	Ambulance Company, No. 1.....	Oct. 25, 1916	Oct. 26, 1916			
Oregon (Clackamas).....	Third Infantry.....	June 27, 1916	July 1, 1916	Sept. 1, 1916	Sept. 5-6-7, 1916.	Sept. 25, 1916
	Troop A Cavalry.....	June 28, 1916	July 1, 1916			
	Battalion A, Field Artillery.....	do.....	do.....			
Pennsylvania (Mount Gretna).....	Division Headquarters.....	July 5, 1916	July 10, 1916	Jan. 8, 1917	Jan. 14, 1917	Jan. 19, 1917
	First Brig. Headquarters.....	July 1, 1916	July 5, 1916	Oct. 4, 1916	Oct. 9, 1916	Oct. 13, 1916
	Second Brigade Headquarters.....	July 4, 1916	July 9, 1916	Jan. 3, 1917	Jan. 17, 1917	Jan. 19, 1917
<i>Ordered home for muster out</i>	Third Brigade Headquarters.....	July 9, 1916	July 13, 1916			
	First Infantry.....	July 1, 1916	July 5, 1916	Oct. 4, 1916	Oct. 9, 1916	Oct. 23, 1916
	Third Infantry.....	July 2, 1916	July 6, 1916	Oct. 5, 1916	Oct. 10, 1916	Oct. 18, 1916
<i>Under orders, Dec. 18</i>	Fourth Infantry.....	July 8, 1916	July 13, 1916	Jan. 8, 1917	Jan. 14, 1917	Jan. 15-20, 1917
<i>Ordered home for muster out</i>	Sixth Infantry.....	July 7, 1916	July 12, 1916			
	Eighth Infantry.....	July 9, 1916	July 13, 1916			
	Tenth Infantry.....	July 2, 1916	July 8, 1916	Oct. 6, 1916	Oct. 12, 1916	Oct. 25, 1916, to Nov. 1, 1916.
	Thirteenth Infantry.....	Oct. 5, 1916	Oct. 10, 1916			
	Sixteenth Infantry.....	July 3, 1916	July 8-9, 1916	Jan. 4, 1917	Jan. 9, 1917	Jan. 13-17, 1917.
	Eighteenth Infantry.....	July 4, 1916	July 9, 1916	Dec. 18, 1916	Dec. 25, 1916	Jan. 6, 1917
<i>Under orders Dec. 18</i>	First Cavalry.....	July 6, 1916	July 12, 1916			
	Machine Gun Troop.....	Sept. 23, 1916	Sept. 28, 1916	Jan. 9, 1917		
<i>Ordered home for muster out</i>	First Field Artillery.....	July 5, 1916	July 10, 1916	Nov. 14, 1916	Nov. 20, 1916	Dec. 4, 1916
	Second Field Artillery (formerly Second Infantry).....	June 30, 1916	July 6, 1916			
	Third Field Artillery.....	Sept. 30, 1916	Oct. 5, 1916			
	Company A, Engineers.....	June 29, 1916	July 4, 1916	Oct. 28, 1916	Nov. 4, 1916	Nov. 10, 1916
	Company B, Engineers.....	do.....	do.....	do.....	do.....	Nov. 13, 1916
<i>Ordered home for muster out</i>	Company C, Engineers.....	July 8, 1916	July 13, 1916			
	First Battalion, Signal Corps.....	June 30, 1916	July 4, 1916	Jan. 5, 1917	Jan. 10, 1917	Jan. 18, 1917
<i>Under orders Dec. 18</i>	Field Hospital, No. 1.....	July 9, 1916	July 14, 1916	Jan. 11, 1917		
	Field Hospital, No. 2.....	June 30, 1916	July 4, 1916	Oct. 5, 1916	Oct. 9, 1916	Oct. 18, 1916
<i>Under orders Dec. 18</i>	Ambulance Company, No. 1.....	July 9, 1916	July 14, 1916	Jan. 11, 1917		
	Ambulance Company, No. 2.....	June 30, 1916	July 4, 1916	Oct. 5, 1916	Oct. 9, 1916	Do.
	Field Battery.....	Jan. 11, 1917				
Rhode Island (Quanset Point).....	Troop A, Cavalry.....	July 8, 1916	July 14, 1916	Oct. 8, 1916	Oct. 15, 1916	Oct. 31, 1916
	Troop B, Cavalry.....	do.....	do.....	Sept. 20, 1916	Sept. 26, 1916	Oct. 9, 1916
	Troop C, Cavalry.....	do.....	do.....	Oct. 8, 1916	Oct. 15, 1916	Oct. 31, 1916
	Troop M, Cavalry.....	do.....	do.....	do.....	do.....	Nov. 6, 1916
	Battery A, Field Artillery.....	June 30, 1916	July 6, 1916	Oct. 10, 1916	Oct. 16, 1916	Nov. 2, 1916
	Ambulance Company No. 1.....	July 9, 1916	July 13, 1916	Sept. 20, 1916	Sept. 26, 1916	Oct. 17, 1916
South Carolina (Lexington County, near Columbia).	First Infantry.....	Aug. 7, 1916	Aug. 11, 1916	Nov. 25, 1916	Nov. 30, 1916	Dec. 7, 1916
	Second Infantry.....	Aug. 9, 1916	Aug. 12, 1916			
<i>Ordered home for muster out</i>	Company A, Engineers.....	do.....	Aug. 13, 1916			
	Troop A, Cavalry.....	do.....	Aug. 12, 1916			
	Field Hospital No. 1.....	do.....	Aug. 13, 1916			
South Dakota (Redfield, to go to Fort Crook, Nebr., for muster out). (Ordered home for muster out.)	Fourth Infantry.....	July 31, 1916	Aug. 5, 1916			
Tennessee.....	First Infantry.....	Sept. 16, 1916	Sept. 19-20, 1916.			
	Third Infantry.....	Sept. 17, 1916	Sept. 20, 1916			
	Troop B, Cavalry.....	Sept. 15, 1916	Sept. 19, 1916			
	Troop C, Cavalry.....	Nov. 7, 1916	Nov. 11, 1916			
	Troop D, Cavalry.....	Nov. 7, 1916	Nov. 11, 1916			
<i>Ordered home for muster out</i>	Field Hospital, No. 1.....	Sept. 15, 1916	Sept. 19, 1916			
	Ambulance Company, No. 1.....	do.....	do.....			
Texas (Camp Mabry).....	First Brigade headquarters.....	May 29, 1916	May 30, 1916			
	Second Infantry.....	May 25, 1916	May 26, 1916			
	Third Infantry.....	May 29, 1916	May 30, 1916			
	Fourth Infantry.....	May 27, 1916	May 28, 1916			
	Company A, Engineers.....	July 27, 1916	July 27, 1916			
	Company B, Engineers.....	Sept. 10, 1916	Sept. 10, 1916			
	Battery A, Field Artillery.....	June 23, 1916	June 25, 1916			
	First Squadron Cavalry.....	June 10, 1916	June 10, 1916			
	Field Hospital, No. 1.....	May 29, 1916	May 30, 1916			
Utah (Fort Douglas).....	First Squadron Cavalry.....	July 8, 1916	July 10, 1916	Oct. 26, 1916	Oct. 30, 1916	Nov. 10, 1916
<i>Ordered home for muster out</i>	Second Squadron Cavalry.....	July 14, 1916	July 19, 1916			
	Battery A, Field Artillery.....	June 27, 1916	June 30, 1916	Dec. 13, 1916	Dec. 16, 1916	Dec. 22, 1916
	Field Hospital, No. 1.....	July 14, 1916	July 16, 1916	Dec. 22, 1916	Dec. 24, 1916	Dec. 30, 1916

History of movements of National Guard organizations called into the service of the United States, etc.—Continued.

State.	Organization.	Date of departure from mobilization camp.	Date of arrival on border.	Date of departure from border.	Date of arrival at home station.	Date of muster out.
Vermont (Colchester).....	First Infantry.....	June 27, 1916	July 2, 1916	Sept. 21, 1916	Sept. 27, 1916	Oct. 11, 1916
	Company C, First Infantry.....	June 27, 1916	July 2, 1916	Sept. 15, 1916	Sept. 20, 1916	Oct. 11, 1916
Virginia (Richmond).....	First Infantry.....	July 6, 1916	July 11, 1916	Jan. 2, 1917	Jan. 7, 1917	Jan. 16, 1917
Ordered home for muster out.....	Second Infantry.....	do.	July 10, 1916			
	First Battalion, Field Artillery.....	Oct. 2, 1916	Oct. 7, 1916			
	Battery C, Field Artillery.....	Oct. 3, 1916	Oct. 7, 1916			
	Field Company D, Signal Corps.....	Oct. 18, 1916	Oct. 22, 1916			
	Field Hospital No. 1.....	do.	do.			
Washington (American Lake).....	First Squadron, Cavalry.....	Oct. 17, 1916	Oct. 23, 1916			
	Company A, Engineers.....	Oct. 18, 1916	Oct. 23, 1916			
	Second Infantry.....	July 4, 1916	July 7, 1916	Sept. 2, 1916	Sept. 6, 1916	Oct. 8, 1916
	Troop B, Cavalry.....	June 30, 1916	July 3, 1916			
	Company A, Signal Corps.....	do.	do.			
West Virginia (Charleston).....	Second Infantry.....	Oct. 18, 1916	Oct. 21, 1916			
Wisconsin (Camp Douglas).....	First Brigade Headquarters.....	July 8, 1916	July 11, 1916	Dec. 27, 1916	Dec. 31, 1916	Jan. 3, 1917
Ordered home for muster out.....	First Infantry.....	do.	do.	do.	do.	Jan. 19, 1917
	Second Infantry.....	July 10, 1916	July 14, 1916			
	Third Infantry.....	July 12, 1916	July 15, 1916	Nov. 23, 1916	Nov. 26-27, 1916	Dec. 14, 1916
	Troop A, Cavalry.....	July 1, 1916	July 5, 1916	Oct. 7, 1916	Oct. 11, 1916	Oct. 20, 1916
	Troop B, Cavalry.....	Sept. 26, 1916	Sept. 29, 1916			
	Battery A, Field Artillery.....	July 1, 1916	July 5, 1916	Oct. 7, 1916	Oct. 11, 1916	Oct. 26, 1916
	Field Hospital No. 1.....	July 13, 1916	July 16, 1916	Dec. 29, 1916	Jan. 1, 1917	Jan. 13, 1917
Wyoming (Cheyenne).....	First Battalion, Infantry.....	Sept. 28, 1916	Sept. 30, 1916			
	Second Battalion, Infantry.....	do.	do.			

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the Secretary of War needs any defense at my hands or at the hands of any gentleman who really knows the man well. He is an able and faithful Secretary of War. He has his duties and responsibilities, and he has performed those duties and met those responsibilities ably and well.

Now, the gentleman from South Carolina, my good friend Mr. RAGSDALE, finds that this man does not treat him with proper and courteous treatment when he goes down there.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Oh, no, Mr. Chairman; I never said that.

Mr. HEFLIN. I got the wrong impression, then, from the gentleman's remarks, and I think the House did.

Mr. RAGSDALE. That is no fault of mine if you drew the wrong impression of it yourself.

Mr. HEFLIN. That may be; but I will leave that suggestion to the judgment of the House.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Then you ought to submit it to the judgment of the House and leave it to them.

Mr. HEFLIN. I do now most respectfully submit that question to the judgment of the House. [Laughter.]

The Secretary of War, Mr. Chairman, has important and serious problems to deal with. The advisability of keeping the soldiers on the border is not a matter that rests entirely upon the broad and manly shoulders of the gentleman from South Carolina. [Laughter.]

The able Secretary of War, chosen by the able President of the United States, is handling that question as best he can and without the aid and advice of the gentleman from South Carolina, and I have no doubt he will be able to handle it to the end without his good offices. [Applause and laughter.] The President of the United States, with his multitudinous burdens, has not yet, so far as I know, invited the counsel of the gentleman from South Carolina in the determination of the question as to whether the soldiers should be withdrawn from the Mexican border. [Laughter.]

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. In a moment; and I regret that the gentleman from South Carolina feels called upon to bear this great burden all alone. I seriously regret it. [Laughter.] Now, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MEEKER. Is the serious problem that the President with his Secretary of War meets that of backing out of Mexico and saving his face at the same time? [Laughter.]

Mr. HEFLIN. The President and the Secretary of War will handle that matter in a manner entirely satisfactory to the American people. They may not be able to handle it to the satisfaction of my Republican friend the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from South Carolina, but nearly everybody else will be satisfied with what they do. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I just want to say this in conclusion, Mr. Chairman: The President and the Secretary of War are handling all of these propositions well, better than I could handle them, and I feel that when they want my advice as to how they shall best conduct the business of the Army they will make it known to me, and when they do I will be ready to advise them. [Applause.] In the mean-

time I shall leave it to my good friend from South Carolina to offer advice as to how best they may conduct these matters. The Secretary of War, I repeat, needs no defense at my hands or at the hands of any gentleman here. He is the able and faithful representative of the United States Government in the War Department, and wherever he is known the people regard him as a perfect gentleman and as a man of superb intellectual power. [Applause.] And as to the man in the White House, his intellectual qualifications tower above ordinary situations like Pike's Peak above the ordinary hills of the gentleman's district. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. RAGSDALE. One of the easy things that some men do is not to represent their people, but by following around and lally-gagging and swinging incense to the President of the United States seek cheap notoriety among the people by letting them know that they are always ready to bow to the President of the United States and lead the public to think that they have a good standing at the White House. [Laughter.] I have no desire to be a favorite here with anyone. I have not come here to try to pose as the favorite of anyone. [Applause on the Republican side.] Nor do I seek nor sit and watch and prepare myself, like the learned and able counselor from the State of Alabama, for the time when the President will send to me for advice. I only pray God that the South Carolina troops will not have to remain on the border until the President does send to him for advice. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HEFLIN rose.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I can not yield.

Mr. HEFLIN. I hope the gentleman will note that the applause is on the Republican side.

Mr. RAGSDALE. The gentleman is so pleased with the sound of his own voice that he can not sit still, even for a moment. He loves to get up and hear himself talk, because he would fain believe, and has taught himself to believe, that he sings a sweet song and does it very gracefully.

Mr. HEFLIN rose.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, I can not yield. But, Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman tells me that the President of the United States may come to us for advice on foreign affairs, I would point to the fact that the President of the United States went the other day to that body that he thinks is qualified to hear him on foreign affairs, and I have no recollection of having read where at the wonderful delivery of the President's views on the foreign situation he sent a highly embellished and beautifully engraved invitation to the gentleman from Alabama to be on the floor of the Senate to hear him. [Laughter on the Republican side.] I have no doubt it was an oversight, and that in proper time he will make amends to the gentleman from Alabama; but up to this time no request has come to the gentleman whose towering hills are the watch towers of liberty, where men are raised and sent here to defend this administration, and to tell us what great and good men they have there, and that we ought to listen to them and disregard the physical conditions and the wishes of the men on the border, while the State of Alabama shines so much brighter than does the

State of South Carolina; but if the gentleman will consult with some of the Senators who represent the State of Alabama, from which he comes, he may find himself in absolute accord with the War Department and the White House, and yet not reflect singly the views of the people of Alabama.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, I have no desire to pose here to-day as reflecting in any degree upon this administration, nor have I even indirectly said that the Secretary of War was discourteous. I merely said that as I understood it the Secretary of War, who in our form of government has always had control of the men in the field, has refused to give me any reason why these men should remain on the border, and has refused to show me any condition that justifies their retention there, and has refused to give me any excuse for the discrimination that I charge now exists; and I shall maintain that position, believing I represent my people at home, even at the expense of receiving strictures from the distinguished gentleman from Alabama. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HEFLIN. Just one word.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I ask for the regular order.

Mr. HEFLIN. Just one word.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi calls for the regular order. The pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn—

Mr. HEFLIN. I ask the gentleman from Mississippi to withdraw that demand.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I will not withdraw it. I ask for the regular order.

Mr. HEFLIN. I desire to reply briefly to the remarks of the gentleman from South Carolina, and I hope the gentleman from Mississippi will not insist on the regular order.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I do. I demand the regular order.

Mr. HEFLIN. Then I make the point of order that there is no quorum present, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Mississippi does not want me to have an opportunity to reply.

Mr. KITCHIN. I suggest to the gentleman that he ask unanimous consent for three minutes.

Mr. HEFLIN. No; I will not do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama makes the point of no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and nineteen Members present, a quorum. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk began reading.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

The CHAIRMAN. That motion has been made.

Mr. BENNET. I move to strike out the last six words.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the Clerk finish the reading of the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will finish the paragraph. The Chair will recognize the gentleman later.

The Clerk read as follows:

Osage River, Mo.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$10,000.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word to suggest a remedy to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RAGSDALE]. He ought to move into some doubtful State. Why should the Secretary of War pay any attention to South Carolina? He is sure of that vote. North Dakota got her troops back from the border, and see what she did on election day. [Laughter.]

Mr. NORTON. North Dakota troops are on the border now and are not making any cry about getting back.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to say another word or two in response to the attack made by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RAGSDALE] upon the Democratic administration. The gentleman calls himself a Democrat and comes from a Democratic district in South Carolina, but the attack made by the gentleman upon the Democratic Secretary of War was applauded only by the Republican side of the House, and if the gentleman from South Carolina enjoys this Republican approval of his attacks upon the Democratic administration, why, he is more than welcome to it. [Laughter and applause.]

Twelve years, Mr. Chairman, I have served in this House, and I never yet made an attack on the constituted authority of my party since it has been in power. I think, in the main, it has performed its duty, and now it is doing it so well that it is entitled to praise, not only of the Democrats, but of Republicans, too. I do not like to hear a man who calls himself a Democrat seriously assail a Cabinet officer who has been as faithful and correct and right as Newton Baker, Secretary of War, and I thought it would not be inappropriate for some Democrat to rise and enter his protest against that performance coming from

a Democrat. If my loyalty to one as faithful as the Secretary of War Baker has excited in the gentleman from South Carolina the impression that I am playing for favor at the White House, he is welcome to all that he gets out of it. [Applause on the Republican side.] I am used to your performances over there. I attended to you on the stump in 12 States in the last campaign. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MCARTHUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes.

Mr. MCARTHUR. Was not one of those States the State of Maine? [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HEFLIN. I was up in Maine in September, but that was before Mr. Hughes got out on the circuit much. After he did get out it was not necessary to go in any of the States of the Union.

Now, since it is all over, while you nominated your strongest man, you are really sorry at heart that you nominated him, all of you. You have been defeated, you are down and out, and we propose to keep you down and out. [Applause on the Republican side.] You have been repudiated by the American people, and we are going to keep those stripes of repudiation where they can be seen. The Republican Party usually makes it plain to see the stripes, and we propose to keep that up.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have no more to say. [Applause on the Republican side.] There is nothing that makes a Republican quite so happy as to hear a Democrat say he is going to quit talking, because whenever a Democrat talks he enlightens the masses, and wherever the masses are enlightened it reduces the number of Republicans in this House. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Missouri River: For maintenance, and continuing improvement with a view to securing a permanent 6-foot channel between Kansas City and the mouth of the river, \$1,000,000; for snagging and maintenance between Kansas City and Sioux City, \$35,000; for maintenance between Sioux City and Fort Benton, \$50,000; in all, \$1,085,000.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 33, line 6, before the word "in" insert "for revetment work, improvement and maintenance near Williston, N. Dak., \$60,000."

Mr. STAFFORD. I reserve a point of order.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered provides for an appropriation of \$60,000 for the improvement of the Missouri River at Williston, N. Dak. The Federal Government has already made some improvements of the river at this point and the appropriation now asked for is needed for revetment work to protect revetment which has already been placed at this point to confine the river to a definite and permanent channel. At Williston the Government has expended nearly a million dollars for the construction of a large irrigation plant. The water for the irrigation project is taken from the Missouri River. Pumping apparatus and water pipes are placed on barges near the north bank of the river and in the work of the irrigation project it has been found necessary to protect the river bank from being washed away and the channel of the river changed.

On the 16th of December of last year Col. McIndoe, of the Division of Engineers of the War Department, made an investigation of the conditions of the Missouri River at this point and stated that there was urgent and immediate need for placing about 5,000 feet of revetment work there to protect the work already in place and to prevent the river bank from being washed away and the channel of the river entirely changed. The bank at this point is now and has been during the past summer washing away quite noticeably. The estimate is that that revetment work will cost about \$12 a foot, and as there is needed about 5,000 feet, it will amount to \$60,000.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. I understand, then, from the gentleman's statement, that this is not a navigation project at all, but is to protect that irrigation project?

Mr. NORTON. It is to protect the river bank at a point near where the pumps and intakes for the Government irrigation project are located and as well to confine the river to its present channel. In addition to improving navigation, the work proposed to be done is necessary to properly protect Government property on the river bank at that place.

Mr. BORLAND. As a matter of fact that irrigation project has not been so successful as was anticipated, and at the present time it amounts to no more than furnishing power for cheap lighting of the city of Williston?

Mr. NORTON. They have not operated the irrigation plant there during the past summer, but they expect to operate this year. About 8,000 acres are now under cultivation under this project.

Mr. BORLAND. Is not this true, that they expected to pump water for irrigation purposes, and used their plant for that pur-

pose, but pumping water for irrigation purposes is too expensive to enable people to farm at a profit in that particular latitude?

Mr. NORTON. Oh, no.

Mr. BORLAND. And, therefore, they have used their power plant to furnish light for the city of Williston?

Mr. NORTON. The statement of the gentleman is not correct. The fact is that during the past few years they have had more than the usual amount of rain in that particular section of the country, and they have not had the need they will have in ordinary years for irrigation.

Mr. BORLAND. So it is not even working as an irrigation plant?

Mr. NORTON. It is true that it did not operate as such last year.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman says it is not a navigation problem and it is not even an irrigation project.

Mr. NORTON. The proposed work is much needed to improve navigation and to protect property on the river bank belonging to the irrigation project and to protect and complete revetment work at this point that was put in there by the Federal Government a few years ago. The improvement already placed there has cost, as shown at page 451 of the hearings, \$63,910.69, and of that amount the citizens of Williston and the Great Northern Railroad Co. contributed \$42,962.63.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask to have the amendment again reported.

The Clerk again reported the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as there has been no report upon this and it is perfectly clear that it is not for the purpose of navigation, the committee has no jurisdiction of it, and I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Dakota desire to be heard upon the point of order?

Mr. NORTON. Yes; I should like to be heard in opposition to the point of order, Mr. Chairman. Clearly the amendment is not subject to a point of order. It is an appropriation for the improvement of the river at the point named and is an amendment which is certainly germane to the bill and to the paragraph which has just been read.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the river and harbor bill is not an appropriation bill, and we have no jurisdiction over rivers except for the purpose of navigation. This is neither navigation nor improvement of the river.

Mr. NORTON. The work proposed to be done under the appropriation provided for by the amendment will improve the navigation of that section of the river just as any improvement along the banks of the Missouri River will. It is true that it will also protect the revetment already in place and that it will protect property belonging to and a part of the Government irrigation project at Williston.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. It is for the purpose of helping the irrigation plant, and we have nothing to do with that.

Mr. NORTON. The revetment work that is proposed to be done there is needed, according to the engineer who recently examined the condition of the river at this point, for the proper protection of the river bank and the revetment work that was done there through an appropriation in this bill six or seven years ago.

Mr. STEENERSON. Is it necessary to irrigate the river before it can be navigated?

Mr. NORTON. If the gentleman knows anything about the Missouri River he can probably answer that for himself.

Mr. STEENERSON. I have been at Williston.

Mr. NORTON. Then the gentleman should know that this proposed improvement is certainly more needed than an improvement of the Red River for which the gentleman is asking.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is made to the amendment. The amendment provides for revetment work, improvement, and maintenance near Williston, N. Dak., in the sum of \$60,000. The Chair knows nothing about the merits of the proposition, but on its face the amendment purports to be a proposition for the improvement of the river similar to all of the other clauses which appear in this paragraph. The Chair, therefore, overrules the point of order.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I understood the Chair overruled the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that there have been no surveys and no report of the engineers upon this matter; besides, we are not accustomed to specify the places where work is to be done. But the main objection to it is that there is no report from the War Department, or any of the engineers, upon which to predicate this amendment and the appropriation which it embodies.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will.

Mr. NORTON. Does the gentleman mean to tell the committee that there are no appropriations in this bill for revetment work and work to protect the banks of rivers?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Oh, in general terms; yes.

Mr. NORTON. Certainly, there are many such.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I say in a general way, but the point I make is we are not specifying the locality for the expenditure in many, if in any, cases.

Mr. NORTON. The committee is specifying between Sioux City and Fort Benton.

Mr. SPARKMAN. There have been several of these propositions presented to the committee, and they have been almost, if not uniformly, turned down by the committee. I hope the amendment will not prevail.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced the yeas seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. NORTON) there were—ayes 13, yeas 35.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the paragraph.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, I thought the Chair recognized me for a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report:

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 33, line 4, strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$100,000," and on page 33, line 6, strike out "\$1,085,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$185,000."

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to make any statement in regard to this except to say that it is practically in conformity with the recommendations of Col. Deakne and Col. Townsend, and I know it will give opportunity for the committee to hear an excellent talk from our friend from Kansas City [Mr. BORLAND].

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I may disappoint my friend from Wisconsin. I do not think he has enough faith in his amendment to argue it, and I do not think I shall. I call for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Missouri River near St. Joseph, Mo.: Completing improvement at Lake Contrary, \$25,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word just to make one observation on the Missouri River here, and that is, after an expense of \$3,234,000 has been had on that branch of the river the commerce, according to page 2763 of the Army Engineer's report, reached 101,822 tons, of which sand hauled 2 miles by the owners was 100,335 tons, or 1,487 tons of commerce hauled by the Government at an expense of \$100 a mile for furnishing the waterway.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Apoon mouth of Yukon River, Alaska: Completing improvement in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 991, Sixty-third Congress, second session, \$45,000.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, would the chairman of the committee have any objection to rising at this point?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let the amendment be reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 39, line 13, at the end of line 13, insert as a new paragraph the following:

"Snake River Harbor, Nome, Alaska: Completing the improvement in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 1932, Sixty-fourth Congress, second session, \$105,000."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RAINEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 20079, the rivers and harbors bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. GRAY of Indiana, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for two days, on account of illness.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. SANFORD] may be excused indefinitely, on account of the very serious illness of his wife.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that his colleague [Mr. SANFORD] may be excused indefinitely on account of the illness of his wife. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. SCHALL, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of George E. Day, no adverse report having been made thereon.

VISIT TO MONTICELLO.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will read a communication from the Hon. FRANK CLARK, of Florida, concerning the trip to Monticello.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House will leave Washington at 9 o'clock a. m., on Sunday, January 28, 1917, on the Southern Railway to visit Monticello, the home of Jefferson. Any Members of the House who desire to go will be welcome. Ladies are also invited. Round-trip fare, including parlor car, \$6 for each person. All who intend going will confer a favor on the committee by at once advising the clerk of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of such intention.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE—SOCIETY OF SPONSORS OF NAVY.

The SPEAKER. There is a bill (H. R. 20252) to incorporate the National Society of Sponsors of the United States Navy which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, but which should go to the Committee on the Judiciary. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HOOR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. McCRACKEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Idaho asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, January 26, 1917, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Laura Long, widow of Silas Long, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1979); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Mason Covell *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1980); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Ellen L. Holmes, widow of Theodore J. Holmes, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1981); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of William Jones *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1982); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Kate Hillier, widow of David Hillier, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1983); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting statements of expenditures and allotment costs of arms, components of arms and appendages fabricated, altered, and repaired during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916, at the Springfield Armory, Springfield, Mass., and at the Rock Island Arsenal, Rock Island, Ill. (H. Doc. No. 1984); to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report of the National Forest Reservation Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916 (S. Doc. No. 643); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting reports from the accounting officers of this department showing what officers of the Government were delinquent in rendering their accounts for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916, together with a list of such officers who, upon final settlements of their accounts, were found to be indebted to the Government, and who at the date of the report had failed to pay the same into the Treasury of the United States (H. Doc. No. 1985); to the Committees on Expenditures in the Interior, Navy, War, State, Treasury, and Post Office Departments and ordered to be printed.

9. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting a deficiency estimate of appropriations in the sum of \$5,000,000 for Army and Navy pensions for the fiscal year 1917 (H. Doc. No. 1986); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

10. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting a supplemental estimate in the sum of \$4,500,000 for Army and Navy pensions for the fiscal year 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1987); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

11. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting supplemental estimate in the sum of \$150,000 for the examination and classification of lands for homesteads for the fiscal year 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1988); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. SINNOTT, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 20362) providing for the extension of time for the reclamation of certain lands in the State of Oregon under the Carey Act, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1352), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. IGOE, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 20414) for the establishment of a probation system in the United States courts, except in the District of Columbia, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1353), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McCLINTIC, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 778) to authorize an exchange of lands with owners of private holdings within the Glacier National Park, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1354), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6799) to establish the Sawtooth National Park, in the State of Idaho, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1356), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. ASWELL, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred sundry bills of the House, reported in lieu thereof the bill (H. R. 20496) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, accompanied by a report (No. 1351), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MAYS, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 5632) for the relief of Aquila Nebeker, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1355), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12787) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Morrison, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 20497) to provide for the correction of clerical errors in invoicing and entering merchandise and to define the scope of the review before the Board of United States General Appraisers in customs litigation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 20498) to amend sections 2 and 13 of an act entitled "An act to promote the welfare of American seamen," etc., approved March 4, 1915; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 20499) to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 20500) to provide for the prohibition of the importation of intoxicating liquors into the Territory of Hawaii and to prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors therein under certain conditions; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. PARKER of New York: A bill (H. R. 20501) to provide for the promotion of Americanization of immigrants through education and to appropriate money therefor; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 20502) providing a tax on certificates of stock; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: A bill (H. R. 20503) to amend section 4414 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the appointment of local and assistant inspectors of steam vessels; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 352) providing for the appointment of a joint committee to investigate and report on the subject of the retirement on annuities of superannuated civil-service employees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CASEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 353) to enable the Department of Labor to conduct an investigation of wages and labor conditions in the coal-mining industry, and making appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 354) authorizing and directing the Department of Labor to conduct an investigation of wages and labor conditions in the coal-mining industry and to report thereon to Congress as early as possible; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. EMERSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 355) to have the President of the United States call together medical experts to discover if possible a cure for the white plague; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SCULLY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 356) authorizing the purchase of Shadow Lawn, with all its furnishings complete, for the purpose of presenting the same to the United States Government; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 357) to create a joint committee from the Senate and House to sit to consider Alaskan needs and legislation; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 358) authorizing the granting of permits to the committee on inaugural ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President elect on March 4, 1917, etc.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 359) to state the rights of nations and to lay the foundations for the establishment of a court of nations, a congress of nations, and international army and navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BENNET: Resolution (H. Res. 466) regarding inquiry concerning Ellis Island; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 467) regarding inquiry concerning Ellis Island; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McARTHUR: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, favoring volunteer retired bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURRY: Memorial from the State of California, favoring legalizing the claims of bona fide operators in the oil fields in California; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McARTHUR: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Oregon, favoring the return of the Oregon National Guard from the Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of Oregon, favoring constitutional amendment providing national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASWELL: A bill (H. R. 20496) granting pensions and increases of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 20504) granting a pension to Conrad Hamman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BENEDICT: A bill (H. R. 20505) granting a pension to Oliver T. Redfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20506) granting a pension to Henry H. Snow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE: A bill (H. R. 20507) granting an increase of pension to Eugene L. Haughton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY: A bill (H. R. 20508) granting a pension to Hugh McGinty; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 20509) granting an increase of pension to Albert Fields; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COADY: A bill (H. R. 20510) granting a pension to Mary J. Whbur; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 20511) granting a pension to Fred Yoemans; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DUPRÉ: A bill (H. R. 20512) to admit Marguerite Mathilde Sildell d'Erlanger to citizenship; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 20513) to waive the age limit and the disqualification of being married in the appointment of Charles P. Norman as a second lieutenant in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 20514) granting a pension to Henry D. Howell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20515) granting an increase of pension to Albert Vantassel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20516) granting an increase of pension to Silas W. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20517) granting an increase of pension to George W. White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20518) granting a pension to William D. Houser; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20519) granting a pension to Joseph Karr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20520) granting a pension to Christian A. Baldwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 20521) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Wetzel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOOD: A bill (H. R. 20522) for the relief of L. O. Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 20523) granting an increase of pension to Silas Shepherd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McARTHUR: A bill (H. R. 20524) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Bowman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 20525) granting a pension to Hubert Hall; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20526) granting a pension to Lyman Frink Gray; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A bill (H. R. 20527) granting an increase of pension to Daniel F. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20528) for the relief of J. H. Livingston; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 20529) granting a pension to Amanda Comer, widow of George W. Comer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 20530) granting an increase of pension to George H. Frush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 20531) granting an increase of pension to Maxwell A. Carpenter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WARD: A bill (H. R. 20532) to remove the charge of desertion against Carlos R. Tompkins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH: A bill (H. R. 20533) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of Arizona Bar Association, favoring creation of additional United States court in Arizona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of Woman's Club of Richard Center, Wis., favoring adoption of woman-suffrage amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petitions of Judson Grenell, Waterford, Mich.; James Minturn, Hoboken, N. J.; William A. Black, C. C. Higgins, James N. Astin, William Dobson, W. D. Courier, J. C. Butterfield, F. E. Tucker, Paul W. Law, Jesse G. Zellous, J. G. Kensherville, J. J. Adams, and N. C. Hinz, of San Antonio, Tex.; John J. Hopper, New York; Grace Isabel Colbron, New York; Fiske Warren, Harvard, Mass.; Frank B. Hays, Alvin J. Barron, Charles H. Earle, J. P. Leonard, James J. Curran, and Benjamin Pelletier, of Lewiston, Me.; Thomas S. Bubier, Eldreth Arnold, S. K. Ballard, H. G. Casey, and W. E. Jackson, of Auburn, Me.; Witter Bynner, Windsor, Vt.; Arthur T. Chase, Boston; F. D. Lyford, W. F. Dudley, John H. Lynch, Michael Malloy, A. B. Soule, Alton D. Allen, Paul Hanschild, and R. H. Thayer, of Lewiston, Me.; H. J. Smith, Z. A. Bailey, H. D. Strout, and J. M. Maxwell, of Auburn, Me., for the passage of House bill 13281, to promote better trade relations with Latin America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNET: Petition of sundry citizens of New York, protesting against the passage of House bills 17850 and 18986, Senate bills 1082 and 4429, and House joint resolution 84; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petition of the George H. Gibson Co., in favor of 1-cent postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of National Model License League of Louisville, Ky., protesting against the passage of prohibition bill for District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Israel Unterberg, protesting against the passage of the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of New York Navy Yard Painters' Association of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting the proposed increase in pay; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Board of Water Supply of New York, favoring consideration of certain items in sundry civil bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of A. G. Hupfels, of New York, favoring legislation for the protection of migratory birds under recent treaty with Canada; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Humanitarian Cult, favoring the Susan B. Anthony Federal suffrage amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Central Federated Union, of New York, protesting the passage of Senate bills 4429 and 1082, House joint resolution 84, and House bill 17850; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE: Memorial of Sheboygan Business Men's Association, protesting against legislation excluding liquor advertisements from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CAREW: Memorial of New York State Fish, Game, and Forest League, favoring passage of House bill 20080 and Senate bill 7858; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: Petition signed by Frank C. Metcalfe and 250 other members of the Glass Bottle Blowers' Association, of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the passage of legislation dealing with the liquor question; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition by Carl Wegner, W. A. Peterman, and 5,000 other citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the passage of Senate bills 1082 and 4429, House bill 18986, House joint resolution 84, and House bill 17850, or any other bills of similar character; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association, of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring the enactment of legislation amending the Panama Canal act so as to permit the continuance of railroad ownership, control, or operation of steamboat lines on the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Gerlinger Steel Casting Co., of Milwaukee, Wis., with regard to the use of water of Niagara Falls; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Snyer Steel Casting Co., of Milwaukee, Wis., urging permanent legislation with regard to the use of water of Niagara Falls; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Oscar Brown, Edward Hintz, William Goetz, and 3,500 other citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the passage of House bills 17850 and 18986, Senate bills 1082 and 4429, and House joint resolution 84; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CHARLES: Petition of Electrical Workers of Schenectady, N. Y., favoring the enacting of House bill 137, providing for the investigation of milk and its products; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COADY: Petition of sundry citizens of Maryland, protesting against the passage of House bills 17850 and 18986, Senate bills 1082 and 4429, and House joint resolution 84; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of Frank E. Wade, favoring the appointment of a probation officer in the United States judicial district; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FESS: Petition of Friends' Church (36 people), of North Lewisburg, Champaign County, Ohio, favoring national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Methodist Protestant Church (100 people), of North Lewisburg, Champaign County, Ohio, favoring national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Chicago Employing Electrotypers' Association, favoring an appropriation for the Bureau of Standards; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the Talking Machine Shop, of Rockford, Ill., favoring the Stephens fixed price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, favoring the Webb bill, House bill 17350; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Central Federated Union of Greater New York and Vicinity, favoring increased pay for Government employees; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Friends of Irish Freedom, favoring resolution warning American citizens from taking passage on armed ships of belligerents; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER: Protests from various manufacturers, against the proposed increase in the tax on corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protests from manufacturers in Massachusetts, against the proposed increase in the tax on the net income of corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Papers to accompany House bill 11829, granting an increase of pension to Jacob D. Peterman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 19914, granting a pension to John T. Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 20521, granting an increase of pension to Jacob Wetzel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEISTER: Memorial of St. Mark's Lutheran Sunday School, First Methodist Episcopal Sunday School, Epworth League, First Baptist Sunday School, First Presbyterian Sunday School, 2,000 people in tabernacle, all of Jeanette, Pa., favoring national constitutional prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KETTNER: Petition of Henry P. Dimond, secretary Dried Fruits Association, San Francisco, Cal., and secretary Canners' League of California, San Francisco, Cal., favoring necessary legislation for the protection to consuming public in case of food products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, telegrams from Robert M. McChargue, of Colton, Cal., and W. J. Hanford, worthy president Aerie 506, Fraternal Order of Eagles, of San Bernardino, Cal., opposing section 10 of House bill 19410; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Arthur W. Frazee, Hemet Baptist Sunday School, Hemet, Cal.; E. C. Cushman, San Jacinto, and 24 others, favoring Webb and Smith resolutions for adoption of prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Rev. William Thomas, Baptist Church; M. B. Allen, Baptist Young People's Union; and Mrs. Estelle Harper, Woman's Christian Temperance Union, all of Garden Grove; Redeemer's Presbyterian Church and 4 others, of Los Angeles; Harriet A. Waldman, Riverside Woman's Christian Temperance Union and 3 other churches of Riverside; Mrs. E. E. Elsdon, Highland Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Highland; Rev. Clyde W. Deming, Methodist Episcopal Church, Needles; and Arthur W. Frazee, Baptist Sunday School, Hemet, all in the State of California, favoring national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Mrs. Allan McIntyre, corresponding secretary United States Daughters of 1812, Pasadena, Cal., favoring passage of House joint resolution 230; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of W. G. Fitzgerald, president Chamber of Commerce, Gilroy; C. N. White, business manager San Francisco Advertising Club; C. A. Bernhard, secretary Ukiah Farmers' Club (Inc.), Ukiah; J. H. Whitaker, secretary Board of Trade, Anaheim; Charles H. Roberts, secretary Chamber of Commerce, San Luis Obispo; and Walter G. Schmidt, Western Precipitation Co., Los Angeles, all in the State of California, favoring appropriation of \$300,000 for Yosemite Park, enlargement of Sequoia National Park, and creation of Grand Canyon National Park; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Edwin R. Snyder, commissioner State Board of Education, Sacramento; Edward Hyatt, superintendent State of California, office superintendent of public instruction, Sacramento; and L. Woodard, Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union, Campbell, all in the State of California, favoring passage of Smith-Hughes vocational-education bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Paul A. Learned, president Cooks, Waiters, and Waitresses' Union, No. 673, San Bernardino; James A. Francis, president Church Federation of Los Angeles, Los Angeles; Julius Gabriel, Gabriel-Meyerfeld Co., San Francisco; John A. O'Connell, secretary Labor Council, San Francisco; and William C. Eddef, secretary Federated Trades Council, Sacramento, all in the State of California, protesting against House bill 18986 and Senate bill 4429; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of John W. Mott, Retail Dealers' Credit Association, San Diego, Cal., favoring passage of House bill 18986 and Senate bill 4429—mail-exclusion bills; to the Committee on the Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of sundry citizens of Maryland, favoring the passage of House bill 20080 and Senate bill 7857; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of James W. Cain, favoring a women's division in the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Miss Sallie Mules and Electric Metallurgical Co., favoring diversion of waters of Niagara River; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Nooker Electro Gem Co., favoring diversion of waters of Niagara River; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Titanium Alloy Manufacturing Co., favoring diversion of waters of Niagara River; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of president Niagara Falls Board of Trade, favoring diversion of waters of Niagara River; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McARTHUR: Memorial of the mayor and common council of the city of Astoria, Oreg., urging appropriation by Congress for the purchase of a suitable post-office site and the erection of a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of Messrs. F. M. Duff, F. H. Johnson, H. M. Cole, O. T. Patterson, Wesley A. Lowney, and W. S. Miller, all of Pittsburgh, Pa., with reference to the Federal suffrage amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Pittsburgh Crushed Steel Co. and Wolverine Supply & Manufacturing Co., of Pittsburgh, with reference to excise tax on net incomes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OAKLEY: Petition of sundry citizens of Hartford, Conn., opposing the passage of mail-exclusion and prohibition bills pending before Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIORDAN: Petition of sundry citizens of New York, protesting against the passage of House bill 18986, Senate bills 4429 and 1082, House joint resolution 84, and House bill 17850; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROWE: Protest of E. La Montagne's Sons against House bill 18986 and Senate bill 4429; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, protest of Man-Suffrage Association of New York against woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of National Temperance Union, of Boston, Mass., favoring national constitutional prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHALL: Petition of sundry citizens of the tenth Minnesota congressional district, favoring increase of rural mail carriers' salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SIMS: Petition of Baptist Sunday School, 90 people; Woman's Missionary Society, 18 people; Southern Methodist

Episcopal Sunday School, 125 people; Methodist Episcopal Sunday School, 75 people; Tennessee Training and Industrial School; Presbyterian Sunday School, 75 people; Baptist Church, 100 people; Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 58 people; Woman's Club, 19 people; First Presbyterian Church, 85 people; Christian Church, 60 people; Christian Church Sunday School, 75 people; Young People's Union, 40 people; Aid Society, Presbyterian Church, 24 people; all of Huntington, Carroll County, Tenn., favoring a national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Papers to accompany House bill 19719, for granting an increase of pension to Wilson J. Parker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petitions of Presbyterian Church, Londonderry; Congregational Sunday School, Hampton; St. John's Methodist Episcopal Church, Stafford; 27 voters, Rochester; all of New Hampshire, favoring a constitutional amendment providing for national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Memorial of John Devoy Branch, Friends of Irish Freedom, Roxbury, Mass., favoring warning American citizens that they take passage or employment on armed ships of belligerent nations at their own risk; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of Bismarck (N. Dak.) postal clerks, for increase of pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the North Dakota Annual Conference of the Methodist Church, favoring exclusion of liquor advertising from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, January 26, 1917.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we pray that we may fully recognize the sacredness of our citizenship in a land built upon such boundless resources, such Divine ideals, such world-wide principles. Thou hast given to us to write the laws of a Christian Nation. We have not exhausted the treasure house of divine wisdom as Thou hast revealed to us Thy will in Thy word. In the fixing relation of these great principles to our national and social life we pray that we may be guided from day to day by Thy spirit, that the law of our land may be a transcript of the Divine mind. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. Smoot and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	Gallinger	Norris	Smoot
Beckham	Hardwick	Overman	Sterling
Borah	Hitchcock	Page	Thomas
Brady	Hollis	Pittman	Townsend
Bryan	Hughes	Polindexter	Vardaman
Catron	Johnson, Me.	Ransdell	Wadsworth
Chamberlain	Jones	Robinson	Warren
Colt	Kenyon	Shafroth	Watson
Culberson	Lane	Sheppard	Weeks
Cummings	McCumber	Sherman	Works
Curtis	McLean	Smith, Ga.	
Dillingham	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Md.	
Fletcher	Nelson	Smith, S. C.	

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I rise to announce the absence of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] through illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. OVERMAN. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. SIMMONS] is absent on account of sickness, and that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON] is absent on account of sickness in his family. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce the absence of the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] on account of illness in his family. I will allow this announcement to stand for the day.

Mr. PITTMAN. I was requested to announce that the following members of the Committee on Indian Affairs are detained in that committee, but if their presence is required for a quorum they will come into the Chamber:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr.